

# Modern Philology

VOLUME XV

November 1917

NUMBER 7

## CORNEILLE'S CONCEPTION OF CHARACTER AND THE *CORTEGIANO*—Concluded

One of the striking features of the *Cortegiano* is its application of the Florentine neo-Platonism to the life of the courtier. Indeed, it is safe to say that no single book gives a better exposition of the *uomo di virtù* as the Renaissance ideal *par excellence*. It is universally admitted that the English "gentleman" and the French "honnête homme"<sup>1</sup> are both derived from the Italian model, for it

<sup>1</sup> Roger Aschan, for instance, writes in his *Scholemaster* (Arber Reprints, 1870), p. 66: "which booke [*Cortegiano*], aduisedlie read, and dilligentlie folowed, but one yeare at home in England, would do a yong gentleman more good, I wisse, than three yeares trauell abrode spent in *Italia*. And I meruelle this booke, is no more read in the Court, than it is, seying it is so well translated into English by a wortheie Gentleman Syr Th. Hobbie." On the general subject in England, see Mary A. Scott, *PMLA*, XVI (1901), 475, and *Elisabethan Translations from the Italian* (Boston, 1916). Cf. further J. W. Holme, *MLR*, V (1910), 145, and Jessie Crosland, *ibid.*, p. 502; also A. Wesselski, *Der Hofmann des Grafen B. Castiglione* (2 vols. Leipzig, 1907), and G. Carel, *Herrig's Archiv*, CXXIII (1909), 441.

The term "honnête homme" is defined by R. Estienne and Nicot (1539 and 1537), according to Livet, *Lezique de la langue de Molière, s.v.*, as "bellus homo, urbanus et civilis," and a citation from Sorel, *Connoiss. des bons livres*, 1671, p. 5, states: "L'épithète d'honneste n'avoit force autrefois qu'en disant un honeste homme, pour signifier un homme accomply en toutes sortes de perfections et de vertus . . . mais depuis qu'il y a un livre de ce nom [namely Faret], il a passé avec raison à des significations plus amples." Interesting, too, is the citation from Furetière (1690): "Honneste on le dit premièrement de l'homme de bien [see the *Cid*, vs. 911], du gallant homme, qui a pris l'air du monde, qui scait vivre. Faret a fait un livre de l'honneste homme." For our purposes, the citation from Molière's *Misanth.*, I, 2:

"Et n'allez point quitter, de quoi que l'on vous somme,  
Le nom que dans la Cour vous avez d'honnête homme."

is perhaps most characteristic.

In addition to Livet's list compare the following: Montaigne, *Essais*, I, 75: "[La mort] vous attrape fuyant et poltron aussi bien qu'honneste homme"; La Rochefoucauld, *Max.*, 203: "Le vrai honnête homme est celui qui ne se pique de rien"; La Bruyère, 385]

requires no demonstration today to affirm that the Renaissance type was "worldly" (*mondain*) and that its moral justification was Socratic and Senecan rather than Christian. Thus, we find that the Cortegiano should be of noble birth, since that disposes him to nobility of action (*gloire*); that he must be "complete," that is, an embodiment of many qualities, harmonized and directed by the reason, for he is a world unto himself and his final appeal is to his own exalted nature; that he must be illustrious, for a man lives by his deeds, and his deeds render his name immortal; that his loves must be spiritual, that is, based on merit and reacting to an ideal beauty of which the beauty of this world is only an image. In the pursuit of this ideal the guide is the intelligence and the agent, the will. I have neither the time nor at present the competence to treat this important question in all of its ramifications. For one thing, the reference to a *souverain bien* was common enough in Corneille's time. Compare the *Cid*, vs. 755:

Et j'en viens recevoir, comme un bien souverain,  
Et l'arrêt de sa bouche, et le coup de sa main;

and *Horace*, vs. 721.

Regardons leur honneur comme un souverain bien;

*Caractères*, édition variorum, 37: "Un honnête homme se paye par ses mains de l'application qu'il a à son devoir par le plaisir qu'il sent à le faire"; Marivaux, *Paysan Parvenu*, part 5: "Son mari, à qui, tout malade et couché qu'il était, je trouvais l'air d'un honnête homme, je veux dire d'un homme qui a de la naissance"; Littré, *Dict.*, remarks: "Nous sommes honnêtes par l'observation des bienséances et des usages de la société."

The French term should be compared further with *prud'homme*, *OF. prodome*.

*Chanson de Roland*, 26:

Produme i out pur sun seigneur aidier;

Crestien de Troyes, *Cligès*, 201:

Par li fet prodome largesse;

Guillaume de Dôle, 5631:

Bien le devoient en memoire  
Avoir et li roi et li conte,  
Cel prodome dont on lor conte,  
Por avoir de bien faire envie,  
Aussi com cil fist en sa vie.

"On trouve bien," says Livet, *op. cit.*, III, 415, "dans Cotgrave (1611, 1650), *prud'homme*, *preud'homme*, chaste, honnête, modeste, vertueuse; mais sous la forme *prude*, le mot ne paraît dans aucun dictionnaire avant le *Diction. royal* du P. Pomey (1676), et encore avec un sens mal défini." Cotgrave, 1632, s.v. "preud'homme": "A vaillant hardie, couragious; also a loyall, faithful, honest, vertuous (also, a discreet) man." Bréal, *Essai de Sémantique*, 3d ed., 1904, p. 101, says: "Nous avons en français l'adjectif *prude*, qui avait autrefois une belle et noble acception, puisqu'il est le féminin de *preux*. Mais l'esprit des conteurs (peut-être aussi quelque rancune contre des vertus trop hautes) a fait dévier cet adjectif au sens équivoque qu'il a aujourd'hui." Cf. Molière, *L'Étourdi*, III, 2: "Elle fait la sucrée et veut passer pour *prude*." On the present usage see the *Dict. Gén.*, p. 1831. The modern meaning of *prud'homme* is "patron," "ouvrier délégué": le conseil des *prud'hommes*; also indicative of an interesting sociological fact.

with Voiture, *Letters*, 51: "A moins que de traiter de l'immortalité de l'âme ou du bien souverain." Moreover, excessive spiritualization is alive in Marguerite d'Angoulême,<sup>1</sup> in the *Pléiade*—especially Du Bellay (cf. the *Olive*), and in the transition writers Charron and Du Vair. Charron, *La Sagesse*, ed. 1595, p. 639, defines *vertu* [*vaillance*] as "la plus difficile, la plus glorieuse, qui produit de plus grands, éclatants & excellens effets, elle comprend magnanimité, patience, perseverance invincible, vertus héroïques, dont plusieurs ont recherché les maux avec faim, pour en venir à ce noble exercice."<sup>2</sup> And in his *Philosophie morale des stoïques* (818) Du Vair expresses the thought, so Cartesian in principle, "que si nous voulons auoir du bien, il faut que nous le dōnions nous-mesmes,"<sup>3</sup> while in another place<sup>4</sup> he says: "La vertu aux âmes héroïques n'attend pas les années, elle fait son progrès tout-à-coup," which has been taken as a prototype for the *Cid*, vs. 405.<sup>5</sup>

aux âmes bien nées

La valeur n'attend point le nombre des années.

<sup>1</sup> See the well-known passage from the nineteenth tale of the *Heptaméron*, ed. Leroux de Lincy, p. 111: "J'appelle parfaicts amans . . . ceulx qui cherchent, en ce qu'ils aiment, quelque perfection, soit beaulté, bonté ou bonne grace, toujours tendans à la vertu, et qui ont le cuer si hault qu'ils ne veulent, pour mourir, mettre leur fin aux choses basses que l'honneur et la conscience reprochent; car l'ame, qui n'est créée que pour retourner à son bien souverain, ne faict, tant qu'elle est dedans le corps, que désirer d'y parvenir." It should be noted, however, that Marguerite (in the person of Parlamente) also combats the stoical ideal: "A dire la vérité, dit Parlamente, il est impossible que la victoire de nous mesmes se face par nous mesmes, sans ung merveilleux ruyell, qui est le vice que chacun doit le plus craindre; car il s'engendre de la mort et ruyne de toutes les autres vertuz" (*Hept.*, XXXIV, 291).

<sup>2</sup> Charron, however, describes the rational type under the heading of *preud'homme*. See *Sagesse*, p. 301: "Or la vraye preud'homme [*sic*] . . . est sage, est libre & franche, masle & genereuse, riant & joyeuse, égale, vniforme, & constante, qui marche d'un pas ferme, fier, & hautain, allant toujours son train, sans regarder de costé ny derriere, sans s'arrester & alterer son pas & ses alleures pour le vent, le temps, les occasions, qui se changent, mais non pas elle, l'entends en jugemēt & en volōté, c'est à dire en l'ame, ou reside & a son siege la preud'homie." The real *preud'homme* is the child of Nature: "[le paysan et autres pauvres gens]. . . . Pour vivre content & heureux, il ne faut pas estre sçavant, courtisan ny tant habile; toute cette suffisance qui est au delà la commune & naturelle."

<sup>3</sup> *Traicties Philosophiques* (Rouen [chez David Gevffroy], 1622), p. 734 (this is found in Vol. II of the *Œuvres du Sieur Du Vair*; hence the page numbering). Cf. also p. 732: "Le bien doncques de l'homme consistera en l'usage de la droicte raison, qui est à dire en la vertu, laquelle n'est autre chose que la ferme disposition de notre volōté, à sùlire ce qui est honneste & conuenable"; and, especially, what he says on p. 747 against ambition: "Composons nos affections, de façon que la lueur des honneurs n'esblodisse point nostre raison, & plantons de belles resolutions en nostre esprit, qui luy seruent de barriere contre les assauts de l'ambition. . . . Que la vertu ne cherche point un plus ample ni plus riche theatre pour se faire voir que sa propre conscience. Plus le soleil est haut, & moins fait il d'ombre: plus la vertu est grande, moins cherche-elle de gloire." The last remark is certainly not Cornelian.

<sup>4</sup> From the XIV *Harangue* of Du Vair.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Coudry, *Guillaume Du Vair* (Paris, 1857), p. 152; but compare what is said below, p. 70, note 1.

When, further, we consider that Corneille had not only read, but taken material from Seneca, Amyot, and Montaigne, and that there was in the heritage of the early seventeenth century a strong current of stoical philosophy,<sup>1</sup> it is clear that his conception of the heroic may well have had, not one, but several sources. At the same time, no single treatise sets forth the ideals of Renaissance society more fully or more definitely than does the *Cortegiano*. The treatise was, as we saw, popular with the generation of 1630, when, following the first period of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, the "courtly" types were being fashioned and defined. Corneille shared in this movement. It would be strange if he had not shared in the influence of the work which was one of its chief sources of inspiration—the more so since his early plays, of an essentially different cast from his tragedies, had at least prepared the way.

Let us now see what are the specific resemblances between Corneille's characters and the *Cortegiano*.

First, there is the question of birth or rank, in which the Renaissance was so much interested.<sup>2</sup> With this the *Cortegiano* proper begins.<sup>3</sup>

*Cort.* 33. Voglio adunque che questo nostro Cortegiano sia nato *nobile*, e di *generosa famiglia*; perché molto men si disdice ad un ignobile mancar di far operazioni virtuose, che ad uno nobile, il qual se desvia del cammino dei suoi antecessori, macula il nome della famiglia, e non solamente non acquista, ma perde il già acquistato; perché la nobiltà è quasi una chiara lampada, che manifesta e fa veder l'opere bone e le male, ed accende e sprona *alla virtù così col timor d'infamia*, come ancor *con la speranza di laude*: e non scoprendo questo splendor di nobiltà l'opere degl'ignobili, essi mancano dello stimulo, e del timore di quella infamia, né par loro d'esser obligati passar più avanti di quello che fatto abbiano i suoi antecessori; ed ai nobili par biasimo non giunger almeno al termine da' suoi primi mostratogli . . . [37] ma . . . avendo noi a formare un Cortegiano senza difetto alcuno, e

<sup>1</sup> Corneille used Seneca and Montaigne in *Cinna*; the former he had already used in *Médée* (1634 or 1635), and Amyot's *Plutarque* is one of the sources (together with Livy and Malret) of *Horace*.

On the philosophic movement of the early seventeenth century, see Brunetière, *op. cit.*, II, chap. vii. Malherbe's translation of Seneca's treatise, *On Giving and Receiving Favors* was first published in 1630, while the *Épîtres de Sénèque traduites par M. de Malherbe* did not appear in print until 1639.

<sup>2</sup> For this question as it appears in the "court" treatises of the seventeenth century, influenced by the *Cortegiano*, see the article of Toldo mentioned above.

<sup>3</sup> The citations I give are from the Clan edition of the *Cortegiano* (Florence, 1906).



cumulato d'ogni laude, mi par necessario farlo nobile, sì per molte altre cause, come ancor per la opinione universale, la qual subito accompagna la nobiltà. Che se saranno dui omini di palazzo, i quali non abbiano per prima dato impression alcuna di sé stessi con l'opere o bone o male; subito che s'intenda l'un essere nato gentiluomo e l'altro no, appresso ciascuno lo ignobile sarà molto meno estimado che 'l nobile, e bisognerà che con molte fatiche e con tempo nella mente degli omini imprima la bona opinion di sé, che l'altro in un momento, e solamente con l'esser gentiluomo, avrà acquistata.

An example is given in the Cardinal of Ferrara, who though young shows remarkable qualities.

Cf. Faret, 5:<sup>1</sup>

Je diray premierement qu'il me semble tres necessaire que celuy qui veut entrer dans ce grand commerce du monde soit *nay de Gentilhomme, & d'une maison qui ait quelque bonne marque*. . . .

Ceux de qui les Ancestres se sont rendus signalez par de memorables exploits, se trouvent en quelque façon engagez à suivre le chemin qui leur est ouvert: Et la Noblesse qui comme vne belle lumiere eclaire toutes leurs actions, les excite à la *vertu par ces exemples domestiques*, ou les retire du *vice par la crainte de l'infamie*. Et certes, comme ceux qui sont nez dans le peuple ne pensent pas estre obligez de passer plus avant que ceux de qui ils sont sortis; de mesme vne personne de bonne maison croyroit estre digne de blasme, si du moins elle ne pouvoit parvenir à mesme degré d'estime où ses Predecesseurs sont montez. I'adjoute à cela l'opinion d'un excellent Maistre en cette science [Castiglione], qui dit que c'est vn charme tres puissant pour gagner d'abord la bonne opinion de ceux à qui nous voulons plaire, que la *bonne naissance*. Et n'y a nulle doute que les deux hommes egale-ment bien faits, qui se presenteront dans vne compagnie sans avoir encore donné aucune impression d'eux qui fist connoistre ce qu'ils pourroient valoir; lors que l'on viendrait à sçavoir que l'un est Gentilhomme, & que l'autre ne l'est pas, il faudroit que ce dernier mist beaucoup de temps, devant que de donner de soy la bonne opinion que le Gentil-homme auroit acquise en vn moment, par la seule connoissance que l'on auroit eue de son extraction.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All the passages cited from the *Honeste Homme* are from the Cornell copy; see above, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> The ultimate source of these passages is Plato's *Symposium*, 178d, except that what is attributed to Love in Plato is here attributed to Birth. Shelley's translation of the *Symposium*, though not literal, gives at least the import of the original: "For neither birth, nor wealth, nor honours, can awaken in the minds of men the principles which should guide those who from youth aspire to an honourable and excellent life, as Love awakens them. I speak of the fear of shame which deters them from that which is disgraceful; and the love of glory, which incites to honourable deeds." In the original this last sentence is: λέγω δὲ δὴ τί τοῦτο; τὴν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς αἰσχροῖς αἰσχύνῃ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς καλοῖς φιλοτιμίαν; cf. 179a for a similar contrast. Compare Marsilio Ficino's *Commentary on the Symposium*; I quote from the Italian version (Florence, 1544), p. 19: "Acciòche adūnche nōi ritornāmo qualche vōlta a la utilitā di Amōre: il timōre della

This insistence on family or birth is strong in Corneille. Compare the *Cid*, vs. 405:

Je suis jeune, il est vrai, mais aux âmes bien nées  
La valeur n'attend point le nombre des années;<sup>1</sup>

*Polyeucte*, vs. 420:

Polyeucte a du nom, et sort du sang des rois.

Even Horace justifies himself to his father by a reference to family; *Horace*, vs. 1427:

Ma main n'a pu souffrir de crime en votre race;  
Ne souffrez point de tache en la maison d'Horace.

And, accordingly, the pride of race speaks forth in Horace's words, vs. 435:

Et comme il [le sort] voit en nous des âmes peu communes,  
Hors de l'ordre commun il nous fait des fortunes.  
Combattre un ennemi pour le salut de tous,  
Et contre un inconnu s'exposer seul aux coups,  
D'une simple vertu c'est l'effet ordinaire. . . .  
Mais vouloir au public immoler ce qu'on aime,  
S'attacher au combat contre un autre soi-même . . .  
Une telle vertu n'appartenait qu'à nous.

Contrast with this the character of Curiace, who though no less valiant does not claim to be a superman, vs. 468:

J'ai le cœur aussi bon, mais enfin je suis homme.

See also the words of the elder Horace, vs. 1661:

J'aime trop l'honneur, Sire, et ne suis point de rang  
A souffrir ni d'affront ni de crime en mon sang.

Second, the unifying element of the Courtier's character is his *virtù*. This is shown in numerous passages of the Italian work; in none more clearly than in the following:<sup>2</sup>

infâmia che da le cöse inoneste ci discosta, & il desiderio della Glôria, che a le onorevoli imprêse ci fâ cãldi, agêvolmente & prêsto da Amôre procedono."

As for France, the influence of the *Cortegiano* is seen in the well-known passage from Rabelais: *Gargantua*, chap. lvii [Lefranc ed.]: "parceque gens liberaes, bien nez, bien instructz, conversans en compaignies honnestes, ont par nature un instinct et aiguillon qui toujours les pousse à faictz vertueux et retire de vice, lequel ilz nommoient honneur." Descartes, *Traité*, Art. 206, reads: "Or la gloire et la honte ont même usage en ce qu'elles nous incitent à la vertu, l'une par l'espérance, l'autre par la crainte."

<sup>1</sup> *Las Mocedades*, I, 409, reads:

Qué imagino, pues que tengo mas valor que pocos años.

This is a more likely source for Corneille here than the passage from Du Vair cited above, p. 67. In any case, it is Corneille who stresses the idea of birth.

<sup>2</sup> On the use of *virtù* by others, especially Machiavelli, see E. W. Mayer, *Machiavelli's Geschichtsauffassung und sein Begriff virtù* (Munich and Berlin, 1912).

*Cort. 130.* Però è necessario, che'l nostro Cortegiano in ogni sua operazione sia cauto, e ciò che dice o fa sempre accompagni con prudenzia; e non solamente ponga cura d'aver in sé parti e condizioni eccellenti, ma il tenor della vita sua ordini con tal disposizione, che'l tutto corrisponda a queste parti, e si vegga il medesimo esser sempre ed in ogni cosa tal che non discordi da sé stesso, ma faccia un corpo sol di tutte queste bone condizioni; di sorte che ogni suo atto risulti e sia composto di tutte le virtù, come dicono i Stoici esser officio di chi è savio: benché però in ogni operazione sempre una virtù è la principale; ma tutte sono talmente tra sé concatenate, che vanno ad un fine, e ad ogni effetto tutte possono concorrere e servire. Però bisogna che sappia valersene, e per lo paragone e quasi contrarietà dell'una talor far che l'altra sia più chiaramente conosciuta.

Cf. Faret 67:

Il faut qu'il soit avisé & adroit en tout ce qu'il fera, & qu'il ne mette pas seulement des soins à s'acquérir toutes les bonnes conditions que ie luy ai représentées, mais que la suite & l'ordre de sa vie soit réglé avec une telle disposition, que le tout réponde à chaque partie. Qu'il soit égal en toutes choses, & que sans se contrarier jamais / [68] soyemesme, il forme vn corps solide & parfait de toutes ces belles qualitez, de sorte que ses moindres actions soient comme animées d'un esprit de sagesse & de vertu.

Unity of purpose, conceived abstractly, is one of the most characteristic traits of Corneille's heroes and heroines. Lanson has shown (*Hommes et livres*, 119) that, like Descartes, Corneille proceeds on the assumption that "few men are so weak and irresolute that they desire only what their passions dictate. The majority are fixed in their judgments, according to which they regulate a part —[the major part]—of their actions." See the *Traité des passions*, Art. 49.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the best illustration of set purpose or dominant *vertu* is the patriotism of Horace. Having once reasoned out his course, and for this the play gives him ample opportunity, Horace never wavers. His patriotism having become a "judgment," it is in the name of reason that he kills Camille. A single line sums up the situation: *Horace*, vs. 1319:

C'est trop, ma patience à la raison fait place.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Charron, *Sagesse*, 144: "Ainsi en l'homme l'entendement est le souverain, qui a sous soy vne puissance estimative & imaginative comme vn Magistrat, pour connoistre & juger par le rapport des sens . . . mais le malheur est, que cette puissance qui est au dessous de l'entendement . . . se laisse la plupart du temps corrompre ou tromper, dont elle luge mal & temerairement."



vizio una imprudenzia ed ignoranzia che induce a giudicar falsamente; perché non eleggono mai gli omini il male con opinion che sia male, ma s'ingannano per una certa similitudine di bene.<sup>1</sup>

Cf. Faret, p. 25 and particularly p. 121:

Leur iugement la [conduite] fait touiours demeurer dans la *raison* & scait retenir la rapidité de son mouuement avec plus de force qu'une digue bien fermée & appuyée, ne peut arrester l'impetuositè d'une riuere, ou les rauuages d'un torrent. [From the section on the *Honestes Gens*].

Descartes [Arts. 41 and 45] remarks: *La volonté* est tellement libre de sa nature qu'elle ne peut jamais être contrainte . . . [les actions] sont absolument en son [de l'âme] pouvoir et ne peuvent qu'indirectement être changées par le corps." Also Art. 48: "Ce que je nomme ses propres armes [de la volonté] sont des *jugements* fermes et déterminés touchant la connaissance du bien et du mal, suivant lesquels elle a résolu de conduire les actions de sa vie."<sup>2</sup>

With all this Corneille agrees. Compare the following examples: *Cinna*, vs. 1696:

Je suis maître de moi comme de l'univers;  
Je le suis, je *veux* l'être. O siècles, ô mémoire,  
Conservez à jamais ma dernière victoire!

*Polyeucte*, vs. 477:

Et sur mes passions ma *raison souveraine*  
Eût blâmé mes soupirs et dissipé ma haine.

*Nicomède*, vs. 189:

Seigneur, si j'ai *raison*, qu'importe à qui je sois?  
Perd-elle de son prix pour emprunter ma voix?

*Agésilas*, vs. 1987:

Un roi né pour l'éclat des grandes actions  
*Dompte* jusqu'à ses passions,  
Et ne se croit point roi, s'il ne fait sur lui-même  
Le plus illustre essai de son *pouvoir suprême*.

"Magnanimity" is reinforced in the *Cortegiano* on p. 368, where it is said that this virtue comes last and strengthens all other virtues:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Du Vair, 733: "Or n'y a-il nul doute qu'en nous le principe & mouuement de nos actions ne soit l'*entendement* & la *volonté*, le bien doncques que nous cherchons doit estre leur perfection, leur repos & leur contentement." And 736: "Or ce qui peut le pl<sup>s</sup> pour nous mettre en ce chemin, & nous apprendre à auoir les mouuements de l'esprit droits, & la volonté réglée par la raison, c'est la *prudence*, qui est à mon aduis & le commencement & la fin de toutes les vertus."

See Lanson, *Hommes et livres*, pp. 115, 118 ff.

"ma essa sola star non pò, perché chi non ha altra virtù, non pò esser *magnanimo*." See Descartes, Art. 161:

si on s'occupe souvent à considérer ce que c'est que le libre arbitre . . . on peut exciter en soi la passion et ensuite acquérir la *vertu de générosité*, laquelle étant comme la clef de toutes les autres vertus, et un remède général contre tous les dérèglements des passions, il me semble que cette considération mérite bien d'être remarquée.

The process whereby a character attains to this perfection is shown precisely in *Cinna*; see Lanson, *Hommes et livres*, p. 125. A further citation from *Horace* may be of interest; the words are those of the king at the end of the play, vs. 1759:

Vis donc, Horace, vis, guerrier trop *magnanime*:  
Ta vertu met ta gloire<sup>1</sup> au-dessus de ton crime.

Cf. the *Cid*, vs. 493:

Chimène a l'*âme haute*, et quoiqu' intéressée,  
Elle ne peut souffrir une basse pensée.

Fourth, the passions are nevertheless not to be wholly rejected; a "good" passion, wisely chosen, gives strength to the soul and insures the victory of the reason.

*Cort.* 367. Però non è conveniente, per levar le perturbazioni, estipar gli affetti in tutto; ché questo saria come se per fuggir la ebrietà, si facesse un editto che niuno bevesse vino, o perché talor correndo l'ome cade, si interdiccesse ad ognuno il correre. . . . *Gli affetti* adunque, modificati dalla temperanza, sono *favorevoli alla virtù*, come l'ira che aiuta la fortezza, l'odio contra i scelerati aiuta la giustizia, e medesimamente l'altre virtù sono aiutete dagli affetti; li quali se fossero in tutto levati, lassariano la ragione debilissima e languida, di modo che poco operar potrebbe, come governorator di nave abbandonato da' venti in gran calma.

*Ibid.* 366. Ed a me pare che quella virtù la quale, essendo nell' animo nostro discordia tra la ragione e l'appetito, combatte e dà la vittoria alla ragione, si debba estimar più perfetta che quella che vince non avendo cupidità né affetto alcuno che le contrasti.

Here again the student of Corneille and Descartes recognizes the principle of combatting one passion with another, as Émilie does in *Cinna*, Pauline in *Polyeucte*, Chimène and Rodrigue in the *Cid*, etc.,

<sup>1</sup> On the use of the word *gloire* in the seventeenth century, see Huguet, *Glossaire des classiques*, p. 184. Descartes, Art. 204, says: "une espèce de joie, fondée sur l'amour qu'on a pour soi-même, et qui vient de l'opinion ou de l'espérance qu'on a d'être loué par quelques autres. Ainsi elle est différente de la satisfaction intérieure, qui vient de l'opinion qu'on a d'avoir fait quelque bonne action."

the occasion of so many of Corneille's *tirades*, and the essence of the following passages in the *Traité*:

Art. 45. Nos passions ne peuvent pas aussi directement être excitées ni ôtées par l'action de notre volonté, mais elles peuvent l'être indirectement par la représentation des choses qui ont coutume d'être jointes avec les passions que nous voulons avoir, et qui sont contraires à celles que nous voulons rejeter.

Art. 48. Or c'est par le succès de ces combats que chacun peut connaître la force ou la faiblesse de son âme. Car ceux en qui naturellement la volonté peut le plus aisément vaincre les passions et arrêter les mouvements du corps qui les accompagnent, ont sans doute les âmes plus fortes.<sup>1</sup>

In particular, cf. *Horace*, vs. 433:

Il [le sort] épuise sa force à former un malheur  
Pour mieux se mesurer avec notre valeur;

and *Polyeucte*, vs. 165:

Une femme d'honneur peut avouer sans honte  
Ces surprises des sens que la raison surmonte;  
Ce n'est qu'en ces assauts qu'éclate la vertu,  
Et l'on doute d'un cœur qui n'a point combattu.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, the supreme aim is tranquillity: the serene soul, *le repos d'âme*.

Cort. 366. Così questa virtù non sforzando l'animo, ma infondendogli per vie placidissime una veemente persuasione che lo inclina alla onestà, lo rende quieto e pien di riposo, in tutto eguale e ben misurato, e da ogni canto composto d'una certa concordia con sé stesso, che lo adorna di così serena tranquillità che mai non si turba, ed in tutto diviene obedientissimo alla ragione, e pronto di volgere ad essa ogni suo movimento, e seguirla ovunque condur lo voglia, senza repugnanza alcuna. . . . Questa virtù è perfettissima, e conviensi massimamente ai principi, perché da lei ne nascono molte altre.

Descartes, Art. 148. Car quiconque a vécu en telle sorte, que sa conscience ne lui peut reprocher qu'il ait jamais manqué à faire toutes les choses qu'il a jugées être les meilleures (qui est ce que je nomme ici suivre la vertu),

<sup>1</sup> See Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> On this whole question see also Coeffeteau, *Tableau des passions humaines* (Paris, 1620), pp. 60 ff.: "Et certes il semble que les Stoïques n'ont remarqué en l'homme autre composition que celle du corps & de l'ame, et qu'ils ont ignoré la diversité des puissances intellectuelles & sensitives, de la raison & de la sensualité; veu qu'autrement il n'y a nulle apparence qu'ils eussent voulu laisser l'Appetit sensitif ocleux en l'homme comme il faut, une fois deluré de tous les mouvements des Passions. . . . Aussi l'effort de la vertu ne consiste pas à exterminer ou à arracher entièrement de l'ame les Passions naturelles, mais à les moderer & à les regir avec le frein de la raison."



il en reçoit une satisfaction, qui est si puissante pour le rendre heureux, que les plus violents efforts des passions n'ont jamais assez de pouvoir pour troubler la tranquillité de son âme.

Nicomède is perhaps the best single example of the possession of this trait. But note also the following:

*Polyeucte*, vs. 723:

Douce tranquillité, que je n'ose espérer,  
Que ton divin rayon tarde à les éclairer!<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, vs. 1191:

J'ai de l'ambition, mais plus noble et plus belle:  
Cette grandeur périt, j'en veux une immortelle,  
Un bonheur assuré, sans mesure et sans fin,  
Au-dessus de l'envie, au-dessus du destin.

And the passage from *Pompée*, vs. 489, which Voltaire condemned for its *esprit faux*:

La même majesté sur son visage empreinte  
Entre ses assassins montre un esprit sans crainte;  
Sa vertu tout entière à la mort le conduit.  
.  
Immobile à leurs coups, en lui-même il rappelle  
Ce qu'eut de beau sa vie, et ce qu'on dira d'elle;  
Et tient la trahison que le roi leur prescrit  
Trop au-dessous de lui pour y prêter l'esprit.  
Sa vertu dans leur crime augmente ainsi son lustre;  
Et son dernier soupir est un soupir illustre,  
Qui de cette grande âme achevant les destins,  
Étale tout Pompée aux yeux des assassins.<sup>2</sup>

By way of corollary it may be added that Corneille's concept of the Prince is entirely in accord with the foregoing ideal. His

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mme de la Fayette, *La Princesse de Clèves*, 1<sup>ère</sup> partie: "Elle lui faisoit voir . . . quelle tranquillité suivoit la vie d'une honnête femme, et combien la vertu donnoit d'éclat et d'élévation à une personne qui avoit de la beauté et de la naissance."

<sup>2</sup> Corneille, according to the *Au Lecteur*, used Lucan as his source for the play. Amyot, who relates the story after Plutarch, says in the simplest language: "et adonc Pompeius tira sa robe à deux mains au devant de sa face, sans dire ne faire aucune chose indigne de luy, et endura vertueusement les coups qu'ilz luy donnerent, en soupirant un peu seulement, estant aagé de cinquante neuf ans, et ayant achevé sa vie le jour ensuyvant celui de sa nativité" (Darmesteter-Hatzfeld, *Seizième siècle*, Part II, p. 151).

dramas, to be sure, are not lacking in contemporary political references.<sup>1</sup> But the "type" is nevertheless well defined. In *Pompée*, vs. 1193, Cléopâtre says:

Il vous plaint d'écouter ces lâches politiques  
Qui n'inspirent aux rois que des mœurs tyranniques:  
Ainsi que la naissance, ils ont les esprits bas.  
En vain on les élève à régir des États:  
Un cœur né pour servir sait mal comme on commande.

Thus according to Castiglione (353), being nobly born, graceful, agreeable, and expert in so many exercises would be vain if

il Cortegiano non producesse altro frutto che l'esser tale per sé stesso. . . . Il fin [354] adunque del perfetto Cortegiano . . . estimo io che sia il guardagnarsi, per mezzo delle condizioni attribuitegli da questi signori, talmente la benivolenzia e l'animo di quel principe a cui serve, che possa dirgli e sempre gli dica la verità d'ogni cosa che ad esso convenga sapere, senza timor o pericolo di dispiacergli. . . . [and] far vedere al suo principe, quanto onore ed utile nasca a lui ed alli suoi dalla giustizia, dalla liberalità, dalla magnanimità [etc.].

And the ideal, thus led up to, Castiglione completes in the statement that the sovereign is (373) "più presto semideo che omo mortale." For

così come nel cielo il sole e la luna e le altre stelle mostrano al mondo, quasi come in specchio, una certa similitudine di Dio, così in terra molto più simile imagine di Dio son que' bon principi che l'amano e reveriscono, e mostrano ai popoli la splendida luce della sua giustizia, accompagnata da una ombra di quella ragione ed intelletto divino.

Here we have the idea of the Roi-Soleil in one of its earliest forms—an idea which, strange to say, Corneille places in the mouth of Camille in *Horace*, when, speaking of the gods, she says, vs. 843:

Ils descendent bien moins dans de si bas étages  
Que dans l'âme des rois, leurs vivantes images,  
De qui l'indépendante et sainte autorité  
Est un rayon secret de leur divinité.

One might also dwell further on Corneille's treatment of love as essentially neo-Platonic. What binds Chimène to Rodrigue is the love of perfection (the *Cid*, vs. 931):

Tu t'es, en m'offensant, montré digne de moi;  
Je me dois, par ma mort, montrer digne de toi.

<sup>1</sup> See Jules Levallois, *Corneille inconnu*, 231 ff.

Pauline loves Sévère because (*Polyeucte*, vs. 181):

jamais notre Rome  
N'a produit plus grand cœur, ni vu *plus honnête homme*.

In *Othon*, Plautine pleads (vs. 311):

Il est un autre amour dont les vœux innocents  
S'élèvent au-dessus du commerce des sens.  
Plus la flamme en est pure et plus elle est durable;  
Il rend de son objet le cœur inséparable;  
Il a de vrais plaisirs dont ce cœur est charmé,  
Et n'aspire qu'au bien d'aimer et d'être aimé.

All of this agrees with the famous discourse from the lips of Cardinal Bembo at the close of the *Cortegiano* (421):

deve allor il Cortegiano, sentendosi preso, deliberarsi totalmente di fuggir ogni bruttezza dell'amor vulgare, e così entrar nella divina strada amorosa con la guida della ragione, e prima considerar che'l corpo, ove quella bellezza risplende, non è il fonte ond'ella nasce, anzi che la bellezza, per esser cosa incorporea, e, come avemo detto, un raggio divino, perde molto della sua dignità trovandosi congiunta con quel subietto vile e corruttibile; perché tanto più è perfetta quanto men di lui partecipa, e da quello in tutto separata è perfettissima.

Where is there a clearer justification for the drama of ideas as opposed to the realities of life? of the Platonism of Corneille as opposed to the Aristotelianism of Chapelain? of the "fiction" of *Polyeucte* as opposed to the "truth" of Racine's *Bérénice*?

But enough has been said to show the relevancy of the comparison. Corneille's conception of character—of human strength and weakness, motive and purpose, etc.—and that of Castiglione practically agree. Not that Corneille need, in any sense, have "copied" the *Cortegiano*; the subject was in the air, and Castiglione's work was itself modeled on the stoical ideals that had long been current. In general, we can agree with Lanson that Richelieu, Retz, Turenne exemplified the heroic type in real life. Some truth certainly there is in Lanson's statement: "Le type intellectuel et actif nous échappe. Nous le nions: nous accusons Corneille de l'avoir inventé. Mais Descartes nous avertit que Corneille n'a pas rêvé." Every philosophy worthy of the name has a background in belief and therefore in reality. Nevertheless, the fact remains (1) that beginning with the *Cid*

voices were raised against the unreality of Corneille's plays, (2) that his great tragedies are practically all of the heroic cast, and (3) that he began to treat the type at a definite moment in his career and in a detailed and consistent manner. "Si c'était rencontre," says Brunetière (187), "ou hasard dans *le Cid*, c'est de parti pris maintenant qu'il va rompre avec l'imitation de la vie commune; et dans le dessin des caractères, il ne se laissera plus désormais guider que par la recherche de l'illustre et de l'extraordinaire." Le cas mérite qu'on le signale à ceux qui répètent qu'en tout art, en tout temps, l'imitation de la nature a été l'objet de l'artiste ou du poète." Rather than explain the change, as Brunetière does, by Corneille's "imagination . . . forte et hardie, héroïque et hautaine, subtile et chicanière"; or, as Lanson explains it, by his "intense actualité,"<sup>1</sup> I should, without denying an element of truth in both of these opinions, explain it specifically by the poet's closer contact with the court (after 1633), where the "ideal" of the courtier was certainly discussed, if not always followed. I repeat: Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, paraphrased by le sieur Faret in 1630, was the breviary of the *honnêtes gens*. That builder of phrases, Balzac, knew the Italian work, and pilfered from it in his *Aristippe*. Why should not Corneille have been influenced by it?

In conclusion, let me say that despite his vanity (which at times seems inordinate) Corneille was by nature timid and simple, at least so La Bruyère avers.<sup>2</sup> His ineffectual struggle against the rules shows that he did not have that daring, which M. Jusserand, for example (*Shakespeare in France*, 92), would grant him. As Searles has shown,<sup>3</sup> the originality which Lanson sees in his independence from Aristotle is itself in large measure an imitation of the Italians: Minturno, Castelvetro, Vettori, etc. Thus his originality consists, not in theory, but in "realization." All his life long he curried the favor of the great: his *examens* and prefaces show that, his *discours* wherein he defends himself, and passage after passage in his plays. Clearly he was not adroit. But he was successful; because his particular genius, rhetorical and enamored of the

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Caractères*, édition variorum, p. 296; cf. Levallois, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> "Corneille and the Italian Doctrinaires," *Modern Philology*, XIII (1915), 169 ff.; see also Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2d ed., p. 246.

grandiose, found an outlet in the heroic type in which his particular age pictured to itself its ideal. In expressing this ideal he is both varied and resourceful, to an eminent degree.

The second quarter of the seventeenth century, with its "blue chambers," its sighing marquises, its aristocratic impulses—above all its preciousness and grandiloquence—was after all an attempt to break with the realities of existence; to realize the individual, not as he is, but as he should be. The parallelism with the early nineteenth century is apparent. Corneille's *Médée* cries out at the apex of her misfortunes:

(Dans un si grand revers que vous reste-t-il ?)—Moi:  
Moi, dis-je, et c'est assez. [*Médée*, vs. 320.]

And the reaction, completed in Racine, is inevitable. Pascal, *Pensées*, §455,<sup>1</sup> reads: "Le moi est haïssable . . . car chaque moi . . . voudrait être le tyran de tous les autres." In short, like Hugo, Corneille is a romanticist, not of the emotions but of the reason. "One can understand," says Professor Strachey, "how verse created from such material might be vigorous and impressive; it is difficult to imagine how it could also be passionate—until one has read Corneille. Then one realizes afresh the compelling power of genius. His tragic personages, standing forth without mystery, without 'atmosphere,' without local color, but simply in the clear white light of reason, rivet our attention, and seem at last to seize upon our very souls."<sup>2</sup>

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Brunschvicg (Hachette, 1907).

<sup>2</sup> *Landmarks in French Literature*, p. 52.

[NOTE.—Mr. Van Roosbroeck, of Minneapolis, has called my attention to the interesting fact that a reprint of Chappuis' translation of the *Cortegiano* was printed by Georges l'Oyselet in Rouen; it is the edition published in Paris, by Cl. Micard, in 1585; cf. Brunet, *Manuel*, p. 1631.

Correction: "pétardes" on p. 3 of the first article should, of course, read: "pétarades."]

## THE CONSULTATION SCENE OF *L'AMOUR MÉDECIN*

*L'Amour Médecin*, according to Molière himself, is "un simple crayon, un petit impromptu, dont le Roi a voulu se faire un divertissement." It was "proposé, fait, appris et représenté en cinq jours" (September, 1665). The comic elements of the little sketch are furnished chiefly by four doctors who, summoned by Sganarelle for a consultation on the case of his sick daughter, spend their time in irrelevant conversation (II, 3); in a dispute as to the nature of the patient's malady and the proper remedies to be prescribed (II, 4, 5); in a reconciliation (III, 1, 2) at the suggestion of a fifth doctor, who urges his colleagues to cease their disputes in order to deceive their clients more effectively. While this is going on, the patient is supposed to be lying at the point of death.

The study devoted to this little play in the Grands Écrivains edition of Molière's works presents most of the contemporary illustrative material which is available, and arrives at the conclusion that *L'Amour Médecin* is not based upon any special contemporary event.<sup>1</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to review the old and to present some new evidence in an effort to establish, or at least render more probable, the contrary point of view.

In the consultation scenes (II, 3-5) which form the kernel of the piece, M. Tomès, after some turmoil, delivers his opinion first: "Monsieur, nous avons raisonné sur la maladie de votre fille, et mon avis, à moi, est que cela procède d'une grande chaleur du sang: ainsi je conclus à la saigner le plus tôt que vous pourrez." M. des Fonandrès then makes his pronouncement: "Et moi, je dis que sa maladie est une pourriture d'humeurs, causée par une trop grande réplétion; ainsi je conclus à lui donner de l'émétique." These two worthies enter upon a violent discussion as to the proper remedy and finally leave the room. In the following scene (II, 4) M. Macroton and the subservient M. Bahys in perfect harmony give their diagnosis and outline a method of treatment. They agree that the patient's symptoms are: "indicatifs d'une vapeur fuligineuse

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de Molière* (Paris, 1873), V, 275.

et mordicante qui lui picote les membranes du cerveau"; that "cette vapeur que nous nommons en grec *atmos* est causée par des humeurs putrides et conglutineuses qui sont contenues dans le bas ventre." After outlining a formidable program of cathartics, M. Macroton and his satellite, M. Bahys, admit that the girl may die, but point out to the distracted father that he will, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing that she has died "dans les formes." According to a note found among the manuscripts of Brossette, Boileau furnished Molière with the names, derived from Greek, of the four doctors who figure in these scenes: Des Fonandrès (mankiller) designated Beda des Fougerais; Macroton (long or great tone) was Guénaut; Tomès (bloodletter) signified d'Aquin; and Bahys (barker or yelper, "aboyeur") designated Esprit.

A scene, similar to the one portrayed by Molière, was enacted in 1661 by four doctors who sat in consultation during a crisis in the last sickness of the cardinal Mazarin. This is the description of it as given by Gui Patin:

Ce matin le Mazarin a reçu l'extrême-onction et de là est tombé dans une grande faiblesse. . . . Hier à deux heures . . . quatre de ses médecins, savoir: Guénaut, Valot, Brayer et Beda des Fougerais, *allerquoient* ensemble et ne s'accordoient de l'espèce de la maladie dont le malade mourait; Brayer dit que la rate est gâtée; Guénaut dit que c'est le foie; Valot dit que c'est le poumon et qu'il y a de l'eau dans la poitrine; des Fougerais dit que c'est un abcès du mésentère, et qu'il a vidé du pus, qu'il en a vu dans les selles, et en ce cas-là il a vu ce que pas un des autres n'a vu. Ne voilà pas d'habiles gens. Ce sont les fourberies ordinaires des empiriques et des médecins de cour, qu'on fait suppléer à l'ignorance.<sup>1</sup>

The situation is the same, and two of the doctors, Guénaut and des Fougerais, are by common consent identical in both cases.

In his *Les Médecins au Temps de Molière*,<sup>2</sup> Maurice Raynaud attempted to identify the other two also, Vallot and Brayer with Tomès and Bahys. According to him, d'Aquin "était grand donneur d'antimoine, par conséquent grand ennemi de la saignée. . . . Il est plus probable qu'il s'agit de Vallot, alors premier médecin du Roi, et qui saignait en effet beaucoup, à commencer par son maître." In opposing the conclusion of Raynaud, the editors of Molière present

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres de Gui Patin* (Paris, 1843), III, 338 f.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, 1862, pp. 135 f.



in the first place a very doubtful argument: "Il est vrai que lorsqu'il [d'Aquin] eut succédé à Vallot (1671), il se garda de pratiquer, comme lui (Vallot) des saignées sur le Roi, qu'il savait en être effrayé: d'Aquin était avant tout courtisan."<sup>1</sup> They also cite in support of their argument Gui Patin, according to whom Vallot opposed bleeding the king in 1658, but they neglect to add the fact cited by them later (p. 327, n. 2), that Patin here is in contradiction with the *Journal de la Santé du Roi*.<sup>2</sup> They are greatly influenced, if not absolutely determined, by the consideration that Molière would naturally have hesitated to present in his comedy, "le premier médecin du Roi," because "Le Roi . . . pouvait trouver bon qu'on le fit rire aux dépens des premiers médecins de sa famille, très mauvais qu'on se moquât du sien, à qui une vie si auguste était particulièrement confiée" (*ibid.*, p. 273). This consideration has weight; it may well have caused the transference of the identification of Tomès from Vallot to d'Aquin by writers like Brossette and Cizeron Rival,<sup>3</sup> who, writing many years later, could hardly have known all the circumstances.

Neither Raynaud nor the editors of Molière make any effort to establish just what was the standing of Vallot at court at the time when *L'Amour Médecin* was produced. In a letter of 1655, Gui Patin writes: "La reine a refusé à Valot la permission de faire venir des médecins pour traiter avec lui le roi et pour consulter pour lui à Fontainebleau. . . . On tient Valot en grand danger d'être chassé . . . au moins en est-il en danger si le cardinal ne le remet aux bonnes grâces du roi et de la reine avec lesquels il est fort mal."<sup>4</sup> Later in the same letter he asserts: "J'ai appris que Valot est fort mal en cour, que la reine l'a rudement traité et presque chassé; que le roi l'a menacé, et qu'il ne tient plus qu'à un filet" (II, 211). A week later he announces: "Aujourd'hui le Mazarin défend Valot et

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, V, 272.

<sup>2</sup> They also allege the fact that a bloodletting administered by d'Aquin was said to have hastened the death of Marie Thérèse. But, as this event did not occur till 1683, it could not have had any influence upon Molière or Bolleau; it may, however, have influenced the identification of Brossette.

<sup>3</sup> Cizeron Rival enlarged upon the notes of Brossette in his *Récréations littéraires* (Paris, 1765), and is generally cited in this connection.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 209.

tâche de le remettre aux bonnes grâces du roi et de la reine, en disant qu'il n'a rien fait que par son ordre" (II, 214). A year later we read: "Valot avoit encouru la disgrâce générale de toute la cour, et même du roi et de la reine; mais le Mazarin l'a maintenu par raison d'Etat et la sienne particulière" (III, 65). A letter of the following year notes with evident relish that Vallot is being called Gargantua: "depuis qu'il tua Gargant, intendant des finances" (III, 77). He is said to have come near losing even the favor of the cardinal (II, 360), but seems to have soon effected a reconciliation, for in a letter of 1658 Gui Patin reiterates: "Le roi d'une part et la reine de l'autre, vouloient faire chasser Valot, et l'eussent fait, mais Mazarin l'a maintenu" (III, 90). A letter of 1659 must reflect at least something of contemporary opinion: "Nous avons à la cour deux médecins fort superbes. Valot est le premier, qui fait tout ce qu'il peut pour attrapper de l'argent et se remplumer de *la grosse somme qu'il a donnée* pour être premier médecin" (III, 153).<sup>1</sup> In 1660 we read: "La reine-mère est fort dépitée contre Valot; on a parlé de lui ôter sa charge, et de le réduire à une pension viagère, en donnant sa place à un autre" (III, 247). A short time afterward: "Valot n'est pas bien en cour. S'il perd une fois son patron il est mal en ses affaires, et sera renvoyé comme ignorant" (III, 257). A letter of November of the same year contains in the way of gossip this item: "Le roi s'est dépité contre Valot, et au lieu de prendre sa médecine l'a jetée par terre" (III, 289). In September of the following year it is said: "Valot est malade de fièvre, rhumatisme et érysipèle. On dit aussi que c'est de regret de ce que le roi lui a reproché qu'il étoit espion et pensionnaire du sieur Fouquet" (III, 390). Finally on August 18, 1665, less than a month before the representation of *L'Amour Médecin*, the king is said to have manifested his displeasure against Valot for something the latter had said against the physician of the queen-mother (III, 549). Granting that the statements of Gui Patin must often be considerably discounted, it seems nevertheless evident that the king could have felt no great displeasure in seeing this physician held up to ridicule, even though he was occupying the charge of "premier médecin du roi."

<sup>1</sup> The italicized phrase may well have some relation to the continued retention of Vallot at court.

The editors of Molière come to this conclusion finally: "D'Aquin et Vallot aimaient, l'un comme l'autre, la saignée; dès lors reste-t-il une bonne raison de substituer au nom de celui-là le nom de celui-ci?" (V, 273). There *is* a good reason, and it consists in the record of bloodlettings attributed to Vallot by Gui Patin, who has very little to say in this regard concerning d'Aquin. To begin with, here is a very significant item from a letter of 1657:

La Duchesse de Lorraine a pris deux fois d'une certaine drogue stibiale, que le charlatan appelloit de l'or potable; et d'autant qu'elle empira fort, le sieur Valot la fit rudement saigner, *inter stibium et lethum*: d'où vient la grosse querelle qui est aujourd'hui entre lui et le petit Vignon . . . qui a dit tout haut que Valot l'avoit tué (*sic*) de l'avoir tant fait saigner; sur quoi j'apprends qu'il court un papier latin imprimé contre le dit Valot [I, 222].

The station of the unfortunate patient and the publicity given to the event were in themselves enough to have fastened upon the physician the reputation of being a bloodletting zealot. During the illness of Mazarin (1660) the statement is made that "Le cardinal Mazarin a été saigné (ce dimanche 1<sup>er</sup> août) en tout sept fois" (III, 245).<sup>1</sup> A little later in the course of the same illness it is announced that the cardinal "a été déjà saigné cinq fois. Valot est bien empêché" (III, 257). Six months later he writes: "Le cardinal a fait de grands reproches à Valot de ne l'avoir pu guérir et d'être cause de sa mort; l'autre, pour paroître fâché de tels reproches, s'est mis au lit et s'est fait saigner trois fois" (III, 337). Finally in announcing a sickness of Vallot himself (1662) Gui Patin announces that, as a preliminary treatment, "Il (Vallot) a été saigné plusieurs fois" (III, 410). These details of resemblance and of circumstance should have at least as much weight as the identification made by Brossette more than thirty years after the event.

The other identification which must be established if possible is that of M. Bahys. In the manuscript notes of Brossette the name of Esprit ("premier médecin de Monsieur") is bracketed after the name Bahis, or Bahys. Cizeron Rival, editor of the correspondence of Boileau and Brossette, enlarges upon this note (*op. cit.*, pp. 25 f.) and adds that Boileau "donna à M. Esprit, qui bredouillait, celui (le nom) de Bahis, qui signifie jappant, aboyant." It is apparent

<sup>1</sup> Inasmuch as Vallot is represented in the closest attendance on the Cardinal at this time, it must have been by his orders.

that a Greek word meaning "to yelp" or "to bark" was not a very apt designation for a man who "stammered." It was for this reason that Raynaud connected the name of M. Bahys with Brayer, the doctor who figures in the consultation on the case of Mazarin. But the editors of Molière reject this identification: "Supposer que Bahys (aboyeur) pourrait bien être Brayer (prononcer brailler) est sans doute une conjecture séduisante; mais puisqu'on nous dit qu'Esprit bredouillait l'allusion devient plus claire encore; tenons-nous-en à Esprit" (p. 274). But a few pages farther on (p. 288) these same editors admit that "La prononciation lente de M. Macroton et le bredouillement de M. Bahys seraient des indications fort claires, s'il était prouvé que Guénaut<sup>1</sup> et Esprit parlèrent ainsi; mais nous ne sommes informés que par des commentateurs de la pièce qu'on pourrait soupçonner d'avoir avancé, pour accréditer leurs explications, ce qu'ils ne savaient pas bien." As a matter of fact, the tradition that Esprit stammered seems to rest upon no more solid foundation than the statement of Cizeron Rival, and his statement seems to have as a basis only the stage direction to the first speech of Bahys: "Celui-ci parle toujours en bredouillant." In other words it all depends upon the correctness of the identification whether we credit Brayer or Esprit with an impediment of speech.

The identification of M. Bahys with Esprit seems however to have existed from the first. The earliest notice of it appears in a letter of Gui Patin, written September 25, 1665, some ten days after the first public representation of the play: "On joue présentement à l'hôtel de Bourgogne *L'Amour Malade (Médecin)*: tout Paris y va en foule pour voir représenter les médecins de la cour, et principalement Esprit et Guénaut . . . on y ajoute des Fougerais, etc. Ainsi on se moque de ceux qui tuent le monde impunément" (III, 556). Since Gui Patin has stated incorrectly the name of the theater where the play was given and the name of the piece,<sup>2</sup> it is evident that Gui Patin did not attend the performance in question. He merely cited current gossip. Gui Patin apparently never attended the theater. In that respect he followed, according to

<sup>1</sup> The fact that Guénaut at this time was a very old man, over seventy, lends color to the epithet in his case.

<sup>2</sup> He confuses it with a ballet of Benserade and Lully given in 1657.

Raynaud, the example of reputable physicians of his time: "Un médecin, comme un magistrat, se serait fait montrer au doigt et se fût perdu dans l'opinion s'il eût paru au théâtre" (p. 409). This statement is quite in harmony with the attitude toward worldly and social amusements assumed by the doctors whom Molière represents. It is suggested also by the query of Pascal: "Qui pourrait avoir confiance dans un médecin qui ne porte pas de rabat?" And in the seventh *Épître* of Boileau, where the satirist passes in review the different types who go to see themselves represented on the stage by Molière, the doctors are conspicuously absent from the list. The editors of Molière, while citing Gui Patin's testimony, admit: "Il est incontestable que Gui Patin ne parlait que par oui-dire; il n'est donc pas étonnant que, dans les bruits qu'il avait recueillis, il y en eût de faux" (p. 268). It was quite natural that the general public, through which Gui Patin's information came, when it saw Guénaut, Vallot—both court doctors—and des Fougerais, who was often called there for consultation, should have jumped at the conclusion that they must have all been court doctors and so have seen in M. Bahys, Esprit, "premier médecin de Monsieur." And so the report came to Gui Patin who, in turn, became the source of Brossette's identification, for Brossette cites a parallel passage from one of Gui Patin's letters in this very connection.<sup>1</sup> There is then no serious obstacle in the way of an identification of Bahys with Brayer, whose name offers such a close analogy to that of the doctor in the comedy.

Molière insisted that the writer of comedy must make "ses portraits ressemblants." And that leads us to a positive and quite convincing argument in favor of the identification of Bahys with Brayer. In the fifth scene of the second act, the diagnosis is taken up and carried on by Macroton and Bahys in a manner which contrasts sharply with the violence of the preceding scene between des Fonandrès and Tomès. Each utterance of M. Bahys merely echoes and stresses what Macroton has just said. For example, "Vous aurez la consolation," says Macroton (Guénaut), "qu'elle sera morte dans les formes." Whereupon M. Bahys (Brayer) chimes in: "Il

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres choisies de feu M. Gui Patin* (Cologne, 1691). This proves that Brossette did not pen his notes till nearly thirty years after the production of the play. His identifications therefore are not to be taken too literally.

vaut mieux mourir selon les règles, que de réchapper contre les règles." Now the names of Esprit and Guénaut are occasionally linked in the correspondence of Gui Patin, but never in a way to suggest a subserviency on the part of Esprit, a point which would lend color to the attitude of M. Bahys in this scene. In fact, a letter of August 10, 1660, dealing with this very illness of Mazarin, which we are presenting as Molière's model, relates that Esprit opposed a prescription of Vallot and Guénaut (III, 245). Three weeks later Gui Patin writes again: "Il (Vallot) a eu de grandes prises avec M. Esprit, en présence de la reine et de Guénaut" (III, 257). On the other hand, here is a passage from a letter of Gui Patin to Falconnet, written in 1663, which presents in the most vigorous terms Brayer in precisely this attitude of subserviency maintained by Bahys. Gui Patin, after stating that: "M. de Longueville est mort à Rouen, *ex duplici quidem febre tertiana, et duabus dosibus vini emetici*," goes on to say:

Notre M. Brayer (Bahys) qui y avoit été envoyé, lui en a fait prendre malgré le refus et les plaintes des trois médecins de Rouen, qui étoient d'avis contraire. Ce n'est pas qu'il ne sache fort bien que le vin émétique est un dangereux remède et un pernicieux poison; *mais il en ordonne quelquefois comme cela à cause de Guénaut (Macroton) qui est son ami, et duquel il espère d'être avancé à la cour*, bien que s'il vouloit être homme de bien il passeroit Guénaut de bien loin; mais avoir Guénaut (Macroton) pour ami par lâcheté, dire quelques mots grecs, avoir 300,000 écus de beau bien, et être le plus avaricieux du monde, cela fait venir de la pratique à Paris [III, 437].

It will be noted in the passage just cited that Gui Patin touches upon the pedantry of Guénaut and Brayer—"dire des mots grecs." Now in his first speech of the diagnosis, Macroton (Guénaut) concludes his discourse upon the necessity of proceeding cautiously with a reference to Hippocrates. Thereupon M. Bahys (Brayer) in the tone of an obsequious disciple, glosses upon what his master has just said and, as if anxious to show that he knows the reference is to the first Aphorism of Hippocrates, cites in Latin the two words upon which the Aphorism may be said to center: "*experimentum periculosum*." Had Gui Patin been as familiar with the play as he was with the frailties of his colleagues in the practice of medicine there would probably be no need of these researches to prove that the four doctors of Molière, Tomès, des Fonandrès, Macroton, and Bahys,



represented respectively the four doctors of the Mazarin consultation, Vallot, des Fougerais, Guénaut, and Brayer.

The fact that Boileau furnished the Greek names of these doctors is attested by Brossette and has never been questioned.<sup>1</sup> And this suggests a certain amount of collaboration. That, in turn, calls to mind those convivial gatherings held by Boileau, La Fontaine, Chapelle, Molière, and others among whom was probably numbered the poet's physician friend, Mauvillain.<sup>2</sup> At these gatherings, "On trouvait au fond des pots les idées hardies ou plaisantes; d'insolentes facéties comme le *Chapelain décoiffé* et *La Métamorphose de la perruque de Chapelain en astre*, naissaient comme d'elles-mêmes après boire."<sup>3</sup> The consultation in question furnished all the elements for one of these "bold" or, if one likes, "insolent" manifestations of the satiric verse of this group of seventeenth-century men of letters. The names produced by Boileau furnish one bit of evidence; another is offered by an allusion in scene iii of the play, which is preparatory to the consultation scenes which follow. In this scene the doctors, instead of discussing their patient's case, spend their time in irrelevant conversation. Tomès (Vallot) and des Fonandrès (des Fougerais) enter upon an argument as to the relative merits of the former's mule and the latter's horse. Now it seems that about the middle of the seventeenth century the mule was the conventional mount for physicians, and the adoption of the horse as a means of conveyance was looked upon as a notable innovation. In fact, according to Raynaud (pp. 79, 80), the horse became a kind of symbol distinguishing the progressives, in the practice of medicine, from the conservatives. The former, moreover, were enthusiastic adepts of antimony, while the conservatives upheld vigorously the decree of the faculty of medicine which proclaimed this remedy a poison. It is significant that in this very year of Mazarin's consultation, Boileau

<sup>1</sup> For another example of such collaboration see Lanson, *Boileau* (Paris, 1892), p. 20: "Un jour, avec Molière, entre Ninon et Mme de la Sablière, il fabrique le latin macaronique du *Malade Imaginaire*."

<sup>2</sup> Mauvillain is generally credited with having furnished Molière with material for his satires against the medical profession. He came from Montpellier and did not find himself at ease in Paris. "Il doit nourrir," says Raynaud, "contre Guénaut et des Fougerais un peu des méfiances que tout médecin étranger à la cour a pour ceux de ses confrères qui courent les places et les hommes" (*op. cit.*, p. 436). See in confirmation of this a letter of Gui Patin of 1662, III, 412.

<sup>3</sup> Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 18.



was writing the sixty-eighth verse of the sixth Satire (published in 1666): "Guénaut *sur son cheval en passant m'éclabousse.*" And Guénaut was one of the most ardent prescribers of antimony according to both Gui Patin (*Lettres, passim*) and Boileau (Satire IV). But des Fougerais was a no less energetic exponent of this "drug," and according to Gui Patin, who was a staunch conservative, "tue plus de monde avec son antimoine que trois hommes de bien n'en sauvent avec les remèdes ordinaires" (II, 595). In 1661 then this matter of the mule and horse was a subject for discussion and satire, but it seems hardly probable that such a minor detail of fashion would have continued so throughout the four years which elapsed before the representation of *L'Amour Médecin*. That Boileau, who certainly had some part in the production of these scenes of Molière, should have touched upon this point at this very time is a decidedly striking coincidence.

After two bits of satire directed against the formalities observed in consultations, the father of the patient appears and insists that the doctors render a verdict. In constructing the two scenes which follow, the author, or authors, evidently had in mind the third scene of the second act of *Phormio*. In the Latin play, Demipho, involved in difficulty by his son, consults three men of law. Two of these, Hegio and Cratinus, after insisting in turn that the other speak first, deliver two opinions which are diametrically opposed. Cratinus: "It is my opinion that what this son of yours has done in your absence, in law and justice ought to be annulled." Hegio: "It doesn't appear to me that what has been done by law can be revoked; and it is wrong to attempt it." Then the third man of law, Crito, says: "I am of the opinion, that we must deliberate further; it is a matter of importance." These few lines of Terence seem, almost without question, to have been the scenario upon which Molière, or Molière and his friends, constructed the two most effective scenes of *L'Amour Médecin*.<sup>1</sup> M. Tomès and M. des Fonandrès each begin by insisting that the other speak first and then offer diagnoses and remedies which are diametrically opposed. The comic element is heightened by the greater rapidity of the dialogue and more violence in the discussion, which, after nearly resulting in physical violence,

<sup>1</sup> My attention was first called to this point by my colleague, Professor J. B. Pike.

ends by their abandoning the consultation.<sup>1</sup> Tomès believes that the patient's illness is due to "une grande chaleur de sang." That may or may not have any relation to the diagnosis given by Vallot in the Mazarin consultation, in which he said, according to Gui Patin, "que c'est le poumon et qu'il y a de l'eau dans la poitrine." The bleeding which he prescribes was, as we have established above, quite characteristic of his method. Des Fonandrès opines that the patient's malady "est une pourriture d'humeurs, causée par une trop grande réplétion." And that is quite in harmony with the solicitude shown by des Fougerais in his examinations of the stools of the cardinal. The remedy that he prescribes, antimony ("vin émétique"), is also in conformity with his usual practice.

The following scene (the fifth) is much more important from the standpoint of this study. The line and a half of Terence is expanded in this scene into three pages. The character of Cratinus becomes Macroton and Bahys. This addition of a character to the three contained in the scenario taken from the Latin play is significant. There was no reason in the nature of the case why another character should have been added and the fact that it is done is a strong presumption in favor of the view that the Mazarin consultation did exert a very direct influence upon the composition of *L'Amour Médecin*. And another argument may be found in the material which is used for filling out this scene. Gui Patin, in a letter written a few weeks before the consultation in question, but relating to the same illness, gives the following account of an earlier conference held by some of these same doctors. It will be noted that Guénaut fills the leading rôle as in the play:

Enfin le mal du cardinal Mazarin est augmenté. . . . On a assemblé plusieurs médecins, quelques consultations ont été faites; il a été saigné du pied et purgé de deux verres de tisane laxative, nec quidquam melius habet. On parle de le repurger, et peu après ils aviseront de lui faire prendre du lait d'ânesse, ou des eaux minérales; *n'est-ce pas afin qu'il ne meure point sans avoir tous les sacrements de cette nouvelle médecine, quae semper aliquid molitur, miscet, turbat, novat, etc.* Guénaut (Macroton) qui est grand maître en ce métier, *dît qu'il ne faut pas demeurer en chemin; quand on ne peut plus sur un pied, qu'il faut danser sur l'autre, et que aegri sunt decipiendi varietate, novitate et multiplicitate remedium* [II, 456].

<sup>1</sup> The similarity between this ending of the scene and an incident which took place during a certain illness of the king has been discussed (Molière, *Œuvres*, V, 327).

The passage, which leads from what is contained in this letter to the conclusion of the dialogue, or rather the two-part monologue, of Macroton (Guénaut) and Bahys (Brayer): seems very short indeed.

*Macroton:* Si bien donc que pour tirer, détacher, arracher, expulser, évacuer les dites humeurs, il faudra une purgation vigoureuse. Mais au préalable je trouve à propos, et il n'y a pas d'inconvénient, d'user de petits remèdes anodins, c'est-à-dire de petits lavements, rémollissants et détersifs, de julets et de sirops rafraîchissants qu'on mêlera dans sa ptisanne.

*Bahys:* Après, nous en viendrons à la purgation, et à la saignée, que nous réitérerons, s'il en est besoin.

*Macroton:* Ce n'est pas qu'avec tout cela votre fille ne puisse mourir, mais, au moins vous aurez fait quelque chose, et vous aurez la consolation qu'elle sera morte dans les formes.

*Bahys:* Il vaut mieux mourir selon les règles, que de réchapper contre les règles.

The final illness of a man so powerful in the state as Mazarin and at the same time so distrusted and so feared could not fail to interest keenly the people of the time and place. It was, in fact, for several months a topic of general conversation and speculation. No subject, not even the pedantry of a Chapelain, offered such seductive opportunities for the production of an *insolente facétie* to a convivial group of seventeenth-century men of letters as the serio-comic incidents connected with the passing of the *éminentissime* under whose power the state and the court chafed. It is inconceivable that Molière should have failed to grasp its possibilities and that he should not have been tempted to appropriate this comic material (his *bien*) which offered itself so conspicuously. That he, alone or aided by his friends, in accordance with his practice in other plays, should have done this while the impression was fresh is a natural supposition. That this was done, and that the little sketch which was thus put together was preserved, and four years later incorporated in the *divertissement* which he was called upon to prepare in the space of five days, is a conclusion which, in view of the structure of the play, of the points of resemblance and the well-attested practice of Molière, seems wholly reasonable.

The close of the second act of *L'Amour Médecin* is hurried and artificial. Sganarelle, unable to make anything out of the discussion of the doctors, decides, in a monologue of four and a half lines, to

go in search of a seller of orviétan. This personage then appears and sings some verses in praise of his drug. He does not appear again in the play, and the whole is evidently a rather lame device to end the act with a little music and a *pas de ballet*.

In the third and last act, one would naturally expect to see the lover appear at once as a beginning of the dénouement. Instead of that, there are two short scenes; the second is short and transitional, while the first represents Macroton, Tomès, and Filerin in a dialogue which has no essential connection with the rest of the play. Filerin is here the chief character, and he delivers a long harangue composed largely of material taken from Montaigne, in which he adjures his colleagues not to risk their standing and their chances of making large profits by quarreling among themselves. He closes with this thoroughly Machiavellian exhortation: "N'allons pas détruire sottement les heureuses préventions d'une erreur qui donne du pain à tant de personnes, et de l'argent de ceux que nous mettons en terre, nous fait élever de tous côtés de beaux héritages."<sup>1</sup>

Filerin was identified by Brossette with Yvelin, "premier médecin de Madame." This is his note: "Acte III, scène I<sup>re</sup> M. Fillerin. C'est M. Yvelin, un des médecins de la cour, duquel il est parlé en plusieurs lettres de Patin. Le nom. . . ." The note ends there. It is evident that he did not have before him the Greek of Boileau. Cizeron Rival, who enlarges upon the derivation of the other four names, has nothing to say concerning the origin of Filerin. Later commentators of Molière have derived it from Greek words meaning "lover of disputes," which does not accord at all with the rôle played by the personage. Others have suggested a combination of Greek words meaning "lover of death" all of which indicate that this name is not in the same category as the other four, which are perfectly clear and appropriate. And that fact bears out our contention that the scene does not belong to the play as it was originally conceived. It also supports, indirectly at least, our conjecture that the scenes of the consultation of the four doctors were not composed at the same time as the rest of the play.

<sup>1</sup> Raynaud objected: "Ici on voit un peu trop que c'est Molière qui parle, plutôt que M. Filerin" (p. 86). However, if we may believe Gui Patin, one of the chief objects of this satire of Molière was in the habit of saying just such things: "Guénaut (Macroton) a dit quatre mille fois en sa vie qu'on ne sauroit attraper l'écu blanc des malades, si on ne les trompe" (III, 541). Dated June, 1665; *L'Amour médecin* is dated September, 1665.

I have been unable to discover anything in the material at my disposal which would qualify Yvelin for the doubtful honor of having been the prototype of Filerin. He plays a very small rôle in the correspondence of Gui Patin. Now if Yvelin actually corresponded in any way to the medical crook represented by Molière, it is well nigh inconceivable that he should have escaped the bitter invectives, which Gui Patin directed with especial vigor against this very class of alleged evil-doers in the medical profession. Raynaud makes a half-hearted attempt to have Filerin stand for the medical faculty of Paris. Soulié<sup>1</sup> having found in contemporary documents a "maître d'armes" named André Fillerin, put forth the hypothesis that Molière designated one of his doctors by this name; it was the profession of a "maître d'armes de tuer un homme par raison démonstrative." The editors of Molière are evidently right in rejecting this explanation as being too ingenious; but the fact of its being made shows the difficulty of accepting the traditional identification. It may be, however, that Filerin does not designate a doctor. It is notable that he uses no medical terms. His harangue is intended solely to induce the other doctors to come to an agreement in order the better to deceive and defraud their clients. Finally, Filerin by the rôle he plays, and the language he uses as he leaves the stage—"une autre fois montrez plus de prudence"—seems to exercise a certain amount of authority over the other doctors; and yet Tomès (Vallot) was "le premier médecin du Roi," while Yvelin was only the "premier médecin de Madame." The correctness of the traditional identification of Yvelin with Filerin becomes still more doubtful in view of these considerations.

The scene in which Filerin appears is wholly unnecessary to the action of the play and has, in fact, often been omitted in later representations.<sup>2</sup> Evidently it was not included in the original scheme of the play, for there is no mention of Filerin in the first and principal consultation. Moreover, Lizette, the servant, in the first sentence of the second act, expressly says that only four doctors were called, or at least were coming to the consultation, at the call of her master. The scene is then an interpolation.

<sup>1</sup> *Recherches sur Molière* (Paris, 1863), p. 276, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See editor's note, *Œuvres*, V, 340.

Now *L'Amour Médecin* was produced at the king's request, as Molière himself informs us, and was played before the royal family at Versailles three times between September 13 and 17, 1665.<sup>1</sup> The poet's words suggest clearly a certain amount of interest, amounting almost to a participation in the production of the play on the part of the king. "Ce n'est ici qu'un simple crayon dont le Roi a voulu se faire un divertissement. Il est le plus précipité de tous ceux que Sa Majesté m'ait commandés; et lorsque je dirai qu'il a été proposé, fait, appris et représenté en cinq jours, je ne dirai que ce qui est vrai." These words attest the interest of the king in the little play. It is in connection with it that he is reported to have remarked: "Les médecins font assez pleurer pour qu'ils fassent rire quelquefois." Le Bret in his edition of Molière ([1773], III, 328) goes farther: "Seroit-ce abuser de la conjecture, d'imaginer que notre auteur . . . avoit reçu de ce maître même le conseil de peindre ces nouveaux caractères, comme il en avoit reçu jadis, chez M. Fouquet celui de peindre le chasseur des *Fâcheux*?" The conjecture does not indeed lack plausibility and the parallel is exact. Having seen *Les Fâcheux*, which had also been *commandé* for his diversion, the king "dit à Molière, en lui montrant M. de Soyecourt: 'Voilà un grand original que tu n'as pas encore copié.' C'en fut assez de dit, et cette scène où Molière l'introduit sous la figure d'un chasseur fut faite et apprise par les comédiens en moins de vingt-quatre heures, et le Roi eut le plaisir de la voir en sa place à la représentation suivante de cette pièce."<sup>2</sup> Molière substantiates this statement in his letter "Au Roi," which prefaces the first edition of *Les Fâcheux*: "Il faut avouer, Sire, que je n'ai jamais rien fait avec tant de facilité, que cet endroit où Votre Majesté me commanda de travailler." We have then in the case of *L'Amour Médecin* conditions exactly similar to those which obtained in the case of *Les Fâcheux*: both, *divertissements* especially ordered for the entertainment of the king and in both of them an interpolated character. In the one case the intervention of the king is attested, in both cases it is known that he was specially interested in the poet's work. The supposition that Filerin

<sup>1</sup> *Registre de La Grange*.

<sup>2</sup> *Menagiana* (1694), II, 13; cited in Molière, *Œuvres*, III, 11.



owes his place in Molière's play to a suggestion of the king is something more than a mere conjecture.

Now the consultation of the second act should have recalled to his majesty an experience of his own which took place in 1658, the humor of which he was probably able to appreciate by 1665. This is Gui Patin's account of the event:

Le Roi ayant à être purgé, on lui prépara trois doses d'apozèmes purgatifs, qui étoient chacun de cinq onces d'eau de casse, et l'infusion de deux dragmes de séné. *Le Cardinal demanda si l'on n'y mettoit rien d'extraordinaire.* Esprit, médecin de M. le duc d'Anjou, dit que l'on y pouvoit ajouter quelque once de vin émétique. . . . Guénaut dit qu'il n'y en falloit donc guère mettre: Yvelin proposa deux dragmes de citro, alléguant qu'elles n'avoient pas tant de chaleur que le vin émétique. Guénaut répondit que la chaleur du vin émétique n'étoit point à craindre, vu que l'on en mettoit peu; *là-dessus Mazarin dit qu'il falloit donc prendre du vin émétique*, dont on mit une once dans les trois prises, le roi en prit une, sauf à lui donner les autres quand il seroit temps, au bout de deux heures le remède passa, et le roi fut ce jour-là à la selle vingt-deux fois, dont il fut fort las.<sup>1</sup>

The italicized passages suggest the important part played by Mazarin in this consultation. This appears still more clearly in Mazarin's own account of the same event, which is contained in a letter, addressed "aux Plénipotentiaires," and dated July 15, 1658:

Je vous diray donc que j'avois grande apprehension que, comme autrefois, *turba medicorum perdidit imperatorem*, il n'arrivast de mesme en cette rencontre, y en ayant six, dont il n'y avoit pas grande apparence que les sentiments pussent estre fort conformes à cause du peu d'amitié qu'il y a entre quelques (uns) d'eux; mais j'employay si heureusement l'autorité et l'adresse qu'allant au-devant pour empescher leurs contestations, ils n'ont jamais pris aucune resolution sur le moindre remède que le Roy ayt pris, qu'ils n'ayent tousjours esté tous du mesme avis; et tous unanimement ont dict et escrit qu'ils devoient beaucoup au courage que je leur avois donné, ne leur ayant jamais protesté autre chose que de traiter le Roy comme un simple gentilhomme, sans hesiter à se servir de l'antimoine, et des remèdes plus forts, s'il y avoit raison de le faire.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres*, III, 88 f. Mazarin, in his account, speaks of "fourteen or fifteen" visits to the stool and two vomitings. *Lettres* (Avenel ed.; Paris, 1894), VIII, 498.

<sup>2</sup> *Lettres*, VIII, 513. It must have been a memorable experience for the king. Here is a passage from another letter of Mazarin relating to the same event: Elle (Sa Majesté) . . . apres avoir tremblé jusqu'à bout (*sic*) pour ne prendre une médecine qu'on luy a présentée, comme Elle est accoustumée de faire en santé, luy ayant esté dict qu'il y alloit de sa vie, (Elle) a pris sa resolution et l'a avalée en trois ou quatre reprises et Elle a commandé aux medecins que, s'il falloit prendre d'autres, et qu'Elle refusast de le faire, ils le laissent, s'il estoit necessaire, et la luy fissent prendre de force (*ibid.*, pp. 503 f.).



It is evident from this letter and especially the italicized passage that Mazarin on this occasion performed a part very similar to that played in *L'Amour Médecin* by Filerin, whose whole purpose, as far as the action of the play was concerned, is summed up in his injunction to the recalcitrant doctors: "Allons donc, Messieurs, mettez bas toute rancune, et faisons ici votre accommodement."

The two following examples are characteristic of the harangue which Molière puts in the mouth of Filerin: "Je n'en parle pas pour mon intérêt; car, Dieu merci, j'ai déjà établi mes petites affaires. . . . Les flatteurs, par exemple, cherchent à profiter de l'amour que les hommes ont pour les louanges, en leur donnant tout le vain encens qu'ils souhaitent; et c'est un art où l'on fait, *comme on voit*, des fortunes considérables." Now although this Machiavellian cynicism did not enter into Mazarin's conduct during the king's illness, it reflects what the general public thought of him. The Mazarinades are full of references to the Machiavellian policies of the cardinal; one of them offers a long list of his creatures at the court.<sup>1</sup> Saint-Simon reiterates the same charges with characteristic violence: "C'est à Mazarin que les dignités et la noblesse du royaume doit . . . la règne des gens de rien. . . . Tel fut l'ouvrage du détestable Mazarin, dont la ruse et la perfidie fut la vertu, et la frayeur la prudence."<sup>2</sup> And Chéruel,<sup>3</sup> while justifying largely the administration of the cardinal, admits: "L'astuce de Mazarin, son goût d'espionnage, ses habitudes mercantiles, son avarice provoquaient la haine et la raillerie. L'avarice surtout flétrit ses dernières années."

Nor was this suspected and dreaded activity of Mazarin confined merely to the political side of court life; it extended also to its more personal and intimate side, for Gui Patin, in spite of his exaggerated acerbity, must reflect something of contemporary opinion when he writes to Falconnet: "La reine-mère a été saignée, le cardinal Mazarin a été purgé et commence d'user des eaux de Saint-Myon; etc. . . . voilà comment traitent ici leurs malades ceux qui disent qu'il faut attraper leur argent, *varietate, novitate, multiplicitate remediorum*."

<sup>1</sup> *Choix de Mazarinades* (Paris, 1853), I, 113 ff. And: "Depuis que Sa Majesté l'a appelé au Ministère, a-t-on vu autre chose que . . . bouffons et que traîtres dans la maison du Roy" (*ibid.*, p. 156).

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoires du Duc de Saint-Simon* (Paris, 1889), XIX, 37.

<sup>3</sup> In his *Histoire de France sous le ministère de Mazarin* (Paris, 1882), III, 408.

Mazarin a emplî la cour de charlatans. . . . Les grands sont malheureux en médecins; ils n'ont que fourbes de cour, des charlatans et des flatteurs étoffés d'ignorance."<sup>1</sup>

It must be admitted, of course, that we have been a long time in hitting upon this similarity between Filerin and Mazarin. If it really existed how did it escape the notice of contemporaries? All that can be said is that the play was a relatively unimportant one, which attracted little attention; that the cardinal had been dead four years, and the four years which were the beginning of a brilliant and absorbing reign; that in any case the theater-going public could hardly have known very much of Mazarin's relations with the court doctors, and that these activities were quite negligible in comparison with the more spectacular and public manifestations of his power.

The writer of this article will be very well satisfied if the part of his work relating to Mazarin is accepted as at least an interesting coincidence.

COLBERT SEARLES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres*, III, 284. Compare the Latin words cited by Gui Patin with those contained in the letter of Mazarin cited above.

As for the name: Filerin might stand for Mazarin as well as for Yvelin. Since no satisfactory explanation of the name has been offered, I would suggest that it is a combination of the final syllable of the name with *filou* ("cheat"). There is a somewhat similar play on words in *La Mazarinade*, "the most celebrated of the pamphlets directed against Mazarin." There one reads:

Va, va t'en, gredin de Calabre,  
Filocobron, ou Filocabre.

[*Choix de Mazarinades*, II, 244.]

## DU BARTAS AND ST. AMBROSE

The reader of *la Semaine* is immediately impressed with the author's intimate dependence upon the writers of antiquity. This sixteenth-century Huguenot, who undertook to portray at length the wonders of the universe, followed the impulse of his age in turning to Pliny and the natural historians of classic times for his details. The fact was apparent, of course, to the men of his own day, and the work evidently received an added charm from the authority of the ancients. Four years after its first appearance, the learned Simon Goulart brought out an edition with an elaborate commentary, in which we may find each marvel of the life of fishes, birds, beasts, and human kind referred back to its parallel in Pliny, Plutarch, Aelian, Dioscorides, or some other of the classic writers. But it is also evident that not pagan authors only have made their influence felt upon the poet. The division of the natural world according to the days of creation, the entire framework from the first chapter of Genesis, links the work immediately with the writings of the Church Fathers. *La Semaine* is, in fact, nothing more than a *Hexaemeron*, like those of Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Ambrose, augmented by the addition of a special discussion on the seventh day.<sup>1</sup>

This affinity did not entirely escape the poet's contemporaries. It was the *Hexaemeron* of George the Pisidian which was generally regarded as the model. M. Pellissier, in his study of the life and works of Du Bartas,<sup>2</sup> notes the expression of this opinion on the part of three early critics, Colletet (†1659), who refers the statement to Frédéric Morel (†1630), the writer of an anonymous sonnet, and Goujet (†1767). To quote from him directly:

... la conception de la *Semaine* n'appartient pourtant pas à du Bartas. "Georges Pisidas, diacre et chartulaire de la grande église de Constantinople (vers 620), avait composé un grand et vaste poème en vers iambiques, intitulé *Hexahéméron*, que du Bartas, qui n'ignorait pas les poètes latins, ni les Grecs, imita en tout et partout, hormis en ses frontispieces, en ses invocations et en ses épisodes. Du moins c'estoit la pensée de

<sup>1</sup> See F. E. Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature* (1912), pp. 89 ff.

<sup>2</sup> G. Pellissier, *La Vie et les œuvres de du Bartas* (1883), pp. 68 ff.

ce docte et fameux professeur du roi, Frédéric Morel, mon maistre, qui traduit ce poëme grec en vers latins." Ainsi parle Colletet. Dans le second volume de l'édition publiée en 1611, un sonnet, qui n'est pas signé, attribue à Pisidas l'honneur d'avoir "choisi des premiers" le sujet de la *Semaine*. Goujet qui sans doute ne connaissait ni ces vers ni les lignes que nous avons empruntées à Colletet, s'étonne qu' "aucun des critiques de du Bartas n'ait observé que notre poëte avait plus qu'imité dans sa *Semaine* ce poëme de Pisidas, traduit par Morel en iambes latins."

So the belief in the dependence of Du Bartas upon the Byzantine poet has become imbedded in the history of letters. Closer examination, however, reveals serious difficulties with this traditional view. In the first place, the earliest printed edition of the *Hexaemeron* of the Pisidian was not issued until 1584, five years after the publication of *la Semaine*.<sup>1</sup> Du Bartas can, therefore, have known the work only from the Greek manuscript, which is a most improbable assumption. And secondly, the points of resemblance are of a quite general character, not such as to carry conviction to the critical student of sources. M. Pellissier says: "Et cependant, du Bartas ne doit à son devancier que quelques détails fort peu importants." But before examining the internal evidence in detail, it might be well to consider the question of dependence upon the earlier writers of *Hexaemera*, such as Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, and their fellows. The possibility of their influence has not been altogether overlooked. Simon Goulart mentions them from time to time in his commentary.<sup>2</sup> M. Pellissier, in a passing reference, recognizes the probability of some connection,<sup>3</sup> and Mr. Robbins, in citing authorities for the topics of the *Hexaemera*, frequently names Du Bartas in their company. But the query whether one or several of these great ecclesiastics influenced the Gascon poet and whether the resemblance is to be explained as due merely to the recollection of previous reading or to direct appropriation of particular passages, seems never to have been discussed. A few hours of study in the *Patrology* will be sufficient to persuade the reader that it was actually St. Ambrose to whom the poet owed his main idea, and that the

<sup>1</sup> See Krumbacher, *Byzantinische Literaturgeschichte* (ed. 2), p. 711, note 1, and Quercius in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XCII, p. 1171.

<sup>2</sup> See the notes on II, 905; II, 1001; II, 1044; III, 699; V, 546; V, 746; VI, 623; VI, 661. He quotes Ambrose directly in the note on V, 170.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

works of the Latin Father lay before him as he wrote; that, in fact, many a passage of *la Semaine* is little more than a paraphrase from the sermons of the Bishop of Milan.

Let us examine first certain transitional passages, in which the poet, in introducing or concluding a portion of his work, turns aside for a moment from the main theme to indulge in an outburst of playful fancy. It will be found that these correspond to the pulpit flourishes with which the bishop enlivens the beginning or end of his sermons. In the fifth book, for instance, Du Bartas closes his account of the fishes and sea-monsters with the words (V, 524-27):

Muse, mon soin plus doux, sortons avec Ionas  
Du flanc de la Balene, et pour ne floter pas  
Tousiours au gré du vent, de l'onde, et de l'orage,  
Sus, sus, mon saint amour, sus, gagnons le riuage.<sup>1</sup>

Compare with this a sentence from the concluding paragraph of Ambrose's sermon on the same subject (V, 35):

Sed iam rogemus dominum, ut sermo noster quasi Ionas eiciatur in terram, ne diutius in salo fluctuet.

Not only the figure and its application, but also the position in the discourse and the half-humorous tone are the same. The poet then passes to his discussion of the birds (V, 528-37):

Cependant qu'attentif ie chante les poissons,  
Que ie fouille, courbé, les secrettes maisons  
Des bourgeois de Thetis, voyez comme la gloire  
Des oyseaux loin-volans vole de ma memoire:  
Leur cours fuyart me fuit, et mes vers sans pitié  
Retranchent de ce iour la plus belle moitié.  
Mais, courage, Oiselets: vos ombres vagabondes,  
Qui semblent voleter sur la face des ondes,  
Par leurs tours et retours me contraignent de voir  
Et quelle est vostre adresse, et quel est mon deuoir.

Note how he describes his oversight of this part of the creation with the figure of one who has bent over the water to watch the fishes and

<sup>1</sup> I have followed in this article the text and orthography of the edition of Du Bartas, published in 1593 by Jacques Chouet, which the Columbia University Library courteously placed at my disposal. My thanks are also due to the Harvard University Library for the use of the edition of 1583, published by Michel Gadouleau.

is recalled from his absorption by the reflection of the birds overhead. Then read the words with which Ambrose begins his discourse on the winged creatures (V, 36):

*Fugerat nos, fratres dilectissimi, necessaria de natura auium disputatio, et sermo huiusmodi nobis cum ipsis auibus euolauerat . . . itaque cum caueo, ne mari demersa praetereant et aquis operta me lateant, effugit omne uolatile, quia dum inclinatus imos aquarum gurgites scrutor, aerios non respexi uolatus, nec umbra saltem pinnae me praepetis declinauit, quae in aquis potuit relucere.*

This recurrence of the same striking figures in both writers in corresponding situations is evidently something more than a coincidence. But conviction of the intimate acquaintance of Du Bartas with these sermons becomes complete when we look at what follows. The good bishop concludes his introductory paragraph with a gentle warning against possible drowsiness (V, 37):

*Nec uereor ne fastidium nobis obrepat in uolatilibus requirendis, quod non obrepsit in gurgitibus perscrutandis, aut aliqui ex nobis in disputatione obdormiat, cum possit auium cantibus excitari. sed profecto qui inter mutos pisces uigilauerit non dubito quod inter canoras aues somnum sentire non possit, cum tali ad uigilandum gratia prouocetur.*

This reappears in the words with which Du Bartas continues his address to the birds (V, 538-45):

*Ie vous pri' seulement (et ce pour recompense  
Des trauaux que i'ai pris à vous conduire en France)  
Qu'il vous plaise esueillir, par vos accens diuers,  
Ceux qui s'endormiront oyant lire ces vers.  
Mais n'ayant peu fermer les veillantes paupieres  
Parmi le camp muet des bandes marinières,  
Pourront-ils bien dormir parmi cent mille oiseaux,  
Qui font ia retentir l'air, la terre, et les eaux ?*

A similar agreement may be noticed in the passage with which Du Bartas turns from discussing the seas to the fresh waters (III, 215-18):

*Mais voy comme la mer  
Me iette en mille mers, où ie crain d'abysmer.  
Voy comme son desbord me desborde en parolles.  
Sus donc, gagnons le port. . . .*

These punning lines are nothing more than the elaboration of a play on words which Ambrose uses in the corresponding sermon (III, 17):

*Sed, ut uidetur, quoniam de mari loquebar, aliquantum exundauius.*

Again, in opening his account of the sixth day, the Gascon compares himself to a guide showing strangers the sights of a town (VI, 1-11):

*Pelerins, qui passez par la cité du monde,  
Pour gagner la cité, qui bien heureuse abonde  
En plaisirs eternels, et pour anchrer au port,  
D'où n'approchent iamais les horreurs de la mort:  
Si vous desirez voir les beaux amphitheatres,  
Les arsenaux, les arcs, les temples, les theatres,  
Les colosses, les ports, les cirques, les rempars,  
Qu'on void superbement dans nostre ville espars:  
Venez avecque moy. Car ce grand edifice  
N'a membre, où tant soit peu luisse quelque artifice,  
Que ie ne le vous monstre.*

This was evidently suggested by the paragraph with which Ambrose introduces the same subject (VI, 2):

*Etenim si is qui explorat nouorum aduentus hospitum, dum toto eos circumducit urbis ambitu praestantiora quaeque opera demonstrans, non mediocrem locat gratiam, quanto magis sine fastidio accipere debetis quod uelut quadam sermonis manu per hanc communionem uos circumduco in patria et singularum rerum species et genera demonstro ex omnibus colligere cupiens, quanto uobis creator uniuersorum gratiam uberiorem quam uniuersis donauerit.*

Once more, Du Bartas cuts off his rather slight discussion of the internal organs of the human body thus (VI, 699-704):

*Mais non, ie ne veux pas faire vne ample reueue  
Des membres que l'ouurier desrobe à nostre veue.  
Je ne veux despecer tout ce palais humain:  
Car ce braue proiet requiert la docte main  
Des deux fils d'Aesculape, et le labouré style  
Du disert Galien, ou du haut Herophile.*

This is the elaboration of the apology which Ambrose makes for his brevity on the same subject (VI, 70):

*Haec ideo strictim percurrimus, ut tamquam indocti obuia perstringere, non tamquam medici plenius scrutare uideamur et persequi quae naturae latibulis abscondita sunt.*



Not only in these transitional passages, but scattered throughout the main narrative there will be found many instances in which the poet owes his material to the Milanese bishop. Among these, I have selected for illustration the account of the parts of the human body; and this, for a particular reason. These sermons of Ambrose are not original. In great part they, also, depend on another source, the Greek *Hexaemeron* of St. Basil. Ambrose has adapted and expanded, but to a considerable extent the substance of the discourse is the same.<sup>1</sup> Hence the query arises whether Du Bartas might not have drawn his ideas directly from Basil. A comparison of texts will demonstrate his closer relation to Ambrose. Thus, in the passages already quoted, while the germ of the idea is in two cases<sup>2</sup> to be found in Basil, no one after looking at both authors would doubt that it is Ambrose on whom Du Bartas depends. In the discussion of the bodily structure of man, however, no such complicating question need be considered, as Basil did not take up the subject in detail and the descriptions are quite independent of his influence. First let us compare the eulogies of the head:

Mais tu logeas encor l'humain entendement  
En l'estage plus haut de ce beau bastiment:  
Afin que tout ainsi que d'une citadelle  
Il domptast la fureur du corps. . . .

[VI, 499-502.]

. . . . ita etiam caput supra reliquos artus nostri corporis cernimus  
eminere praestantissimumque esse omnium . . . . tamquam arcem inter  
reliqua urbis moenia [VI, 55].

Immediately following is the praise of the eyes:

Les yeux, guides du corps, sont mis en sentinelle  
Au plus notable endroit de ceste citadelle,  
Pour descourir de loing, et garder qu'aucun mal  
N'assaille au despourueu le diuin animal.

[509-12.]

<sup>1</sup> With regard to the relation of Ambrose and Basil, see F. E. Robbins, *op. cit.*, pp. 58 ff.; Foerster, *Ambrosius, Bischof von Mailand*, pp. 117 ff.; and particularly Schenkl's edition of Ambrose, Vol. I, in which the parallel passages are noted.

<sup>2</sup> Basil makes a rhetorical reference to Jonah, *Hex. VII*, 6 (Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, XXIX, 164 A). The expression of Ambrose may have originally been suggested to his mind by this, but there is no real similarity in the passages. The words of Ambrose on the oversight of the birds (V, 36) were evidently drawn from Basil, *Hex. VIII*, 3, 168 C. But the figure of the reflection in the water and the hint against drowsiness which follows are not in the Greek writer.

Adhaerent uelut quibusdam montium superciliis oculi, ut et protegente montis cacumine tutiores sint et tamquam in summo locati de quadam scaena superiore uniuersa prospectent. neque enim oportebat eos humiles esse sicut aures uel os ipsosque narium interiores sinus. specula enim semper ex alto est, ut aduenientium cateruarum hostilium explorari possit aduentus, ne inprouiso occupent otiantem uel urbis populum uel imperatoris exercitum. sic latronum quoque cauentur incursus, si exploratores in muris aut turribus aut montis excelsi supercilio sint locati, ut desuper spectent plana regionum, in quibus insidiae latronum latere non possint. . . . nobis autem in summa corporis parte constitui oculos oportuit tamquam in arce et ab omni uel minima offensione defendi. . . . [VI, 59, 60].

Particular notice is given to the protected position of the eyes:

Ces miroirs de l'esprit, ces doux luisans flambeaux  
Ces doux carquois d'amour, ont si tendres les peaux,  
Par qui (comme à trauers deux luisantes verrieres)  
Ils dardent par momens leurs plus viues lumieres,  
Qu'ils s'esteindroyent bien tost, si Dieu de toutes pars,  
Ne les auoit couuers de fermes bouleuars:  
Logeant si dextrement tant et tant de merueilles  
Entre le nez, le front, et les ioues vermeilles,  
Ainsi qu'en deux vallons plaisamment embrassez  
De tertres, qui ne sont ni peu ni trop haussez.

[523-32.]

Itaque ne uel usu muneris aliquid detraheretur uel aliquid ad propulsandam iniuriam <non> prospiceretur, eo loco oculos constituit, cui supercilia desuper non minimum protectionis impertiant, subter malae aliquantulum eleuatae haut exiguum munitionis adiungant, interiorem partem saepiant nares, exteriorem quoque frontis malarumque gibbi extuberantes et licet ossuum compage conexas et aequata confinia circumuallare uideantur [VI, 60].

The eye-lashes, also, are noticed:

Et puis comme le toiet preserue de son aïse  
Des iniures du Ciel la muraille nouuelle;  
On void mille dangers loin de l'oeil repoussez  
Par le prompt mouuement des sourcils herissez.

[VI, 533-36.]

Haec ne qua incidentis iniuriae offensione laedantur, pilis hinc inde consertis uelut quodam uallo per circuitum muniuntur [VI, 60].

The nose, we are told, has three uses. Of these the last two may be traced back to Ambrose:

Le nez est vn conduit qui reprend et redonne  
L'esprit dont nous viuons; le nez est vn tuyau,

Par qui l'os spongeux de l'humide cerueau  
 Hume la douce odeur: le nez est la gouttiere,  
 Par qui les excremens de pesante matiere  
 S'euacuent en bas. . . .

[VI, 542-47.]

De naribus autem quid loquar, quae biuio et procero foramine antrum quoddam recipiendis odoribus praestant, ut non perfunctorie odor transeat, sed diutius inhaereat naribus et earum ductu cerebrum sensusque depascat? . . . per eas quoque purgamenta capitis defluunt et sine fraude atque offensione aliqua corporis deriuantur [VI, 63].

In the treatment of the mouth and teeth, Du Bartas departs from Ambrose (VI, 65-68), and though general resemblances may be found, it is not worth while to quote the passages. But the lines on the ears show a striking agreement:

Et d'autant que tout son semble tousiours monter,  
 Le Tout-puissant voulut les oreilles planter  
 Au haut du bastiment, ainsi qu'en deux garites,  
 Coquillant leur canaux, si que les voix conduites  
 Par les obliques plis de ses deux limaçons,  
 Tousiours de plus en plus en allongent leurs sons:  
 Comme l'air de la trompe ou de la saquebutte  
 Dure plus que celui qui passe par la flute:  
 Ou tout ainsi qu'un bruit s'estend par les destours  
 D'un escarté vallon, ou court avec le cours  
 D'un fleuve serpentant, ou rompu, se redouble,  
 Passant entre les dents de quelque roche double.  
 Ce qu'il fit d'autre part, afin qu'un rude bruit  
 Traversant à droit fil l'un et l'autre conduit,  
 N'estourdist le cerueau, ains enuoyast plus molles  
 Par ce courbé Dedale à l'esprit nos paroles.

[VI, 603-18.]

The use of the winding channels as a protection and particularly the comparison to the reverberation of sound in a valley or along a winding river or between crags come directly from Ambrose:

Ideo aures extantiores sunt . . . ut in earum sinibus uox reperiens sine offensione interioris ingrediatur anfractus. nam nisi ita esset, quis non ad omnem fortioris sonum uocis adtonitus redderetur, cum inter ista subsidia frequenter inproviso ictus clamore nos obsurdiscere sentiamus . . . tenaces praeterea sermonis accepti ipsos esse anfractus aurium usus ipse nos docet, siquidem uel in concauis montium uel in recessu rupium uel in anfractu fluminum uox auditur dulcior et responsa suauius referens echo resultat [VI, 62].

In the discussion of the internal organs, also, the Gascon shows his familiarity with the old *Hexaameron*. Thus his lines on the brain (VI, 645-48),

Thresoriere des arts, source du sentiment,  
Siege de la raison, fertile commencement  
Des nerfs de nostre corps:

repeat the Latin:

Initium enim neruorum et omnium sensuum uoluntariae commotionis cerebrum est atque inde omnis eorum quae diximus causa manat [VI, 61].

And the description of the pulse (VI, 665-68),

Là le subtil esprit sans cesse ba-batant,  
Tesmoigne la santé d'un poulx tout-iour constant:  
Ou changeant à tous coups de bransle et de mesure,  
Monstre que l'accident peut plus que la nature,

is simply an amplification of:

Uenarum pulsus uel infirmitatis internuntius uel salutis est [VI, 73].

It is not necessary to quote further at length. I give the references to the series of passages, which I have noted, in which Du Bartas shows the influence of the Milanese bishop.<sup>1</sup> Among them are included several in which the details differ. Du Bartas frequently supplements the version of the church father from Pliny and other writers, or even substitutes a varying account. An asterisk is prefixed to instances in which Ambrose is independent of the *Hexaameron* of Basil.

*La Semaine* I, 293 ff. The Spirit of God moves on the face of the waters. Ambrose *Hexaameron*, I, 29.

\*I, 345 ff. Theories of the Greeks as to the eternal existence of the heavens. *Hex.* I, 3.

\*I, 423 ff. Why God did not complete the world in a moment. An example of patience to human workmen. *Hex.* I, 27.

II, 209 ff. The polypus as an example of changefulness. The figure may be influenced by *Hex.* V, 21, where the animal is described. It is, however, a commonplace of ancient literature.

II, 285 ff. The several qualities and mutual relations of the four elements. *Hex.* III, 18.

II, 465 ff. The cupping-glass as an illustration of the phenomenon of evaporation, *Hex.* II, 13.

<sup>1</sup> A number of these have already been noted by Mr. Robbins, *op. cit.*, without, however, any direct connection between Du Bartas and Ambrose being suggested.

II, 887 ff. The Aristotelian and Platonic views as to the constitution of the heavens. *Hex. I*, 23, 24. With the reference to St. Paul (947) cf. *Hex. II*, 6, 24 F.

II, 953 ff. The number of the heavens—one or more. *Hex. II*, 5, 6.

II, 1007 ff. Polemic against those who deny the existence of waters above the heavens. *Hex. II*, 9–12. For the formation of pearls (vs. 1060), cf. *Hex. V*, 33, 93 F.

III, 25 ff. God sets bounds to the sea. *Hex. III*, 10.

\*III, 61 ff. Illustrations of God's power over the waters. For the Red Sea and the Jordan, see *Hex. III*, 2, 33 CD. For the deluge and the smitten rock, see *Hex. III*, 9, 36 DF.

III, 69 ff. The catalogue of gulfs and arms of the sea was probably suggested by *Hex. III*, 12, 13.

III, 97 ff. Catalogue of rivers. The Nile, the Rhine, the Danube, the Rhone, the Po, are mentioned in both accounts. *Hex. II*, 12.

III, 153 ff. The evaporation of water and its return in the streams. *Hex. II*, 12, 13.

III, 179 ff. The moon as the cause of the tides. *Hex. IV*, 30.

III, 209 ff. The saltness of the sea explained by the action of the sun. *Hex. II*, 14, 29 DE.

\*III, 215 ff. Transition. Like the seas, we have escaped our bounds. *Hex. III*, 17.

III, 509 ff. The description of the vine corresponds to *Hex. III*, 49, to which, however, it shows but little resemblance.

\*III, 533 ff. The beauty of the flowers. *Hex. III*, 36.

\*III, 543 ff. The divine providence displayed in medicinal herbs. *Hex. III*, 37.

III, 657 f. Hemlock, a food for starlings, a poison for man. *Hex. III*, 39, 48 A.

III, 699 ff. Description of wheat and its growth. *Hex. III*, 34.

IV, 405 ff. The spirited defense of astrology was called forth by the attack upon it. *Hex. IV*, 13–20. For the influence of the moon on the marrow of animals, the meat of oysters, and the wood of trees (vs. 437 ff.), see *Hex. IV*, 29, 76 AB.

\*V, 35 ff. The plants and animals of earth have their counterparts in the sea. *Hex. V*, 5, 6.

V, 93 ff. The monsters of the deep, like islands. *Hex. V*, 28, 32.

V, 119 ff. The migrations of the fishes with the seasons. *Hex. V*, 29.

V, 160 ff. Their sense for their lawful habitations and their knowledge of times and places. *Hex. V*, 28, 29.

V, 386 ff. The remora. Du Bartas drew largely on Pliny xxxii. 1. The figure of the firmly rooted oak, which is not in Pliny, seems to be an elaboration of the words *quasi radicatam* in the description of Ambrose *Hex. V*, 31.

\*V, 524 ff. Transition. Like Jonah, let us seek the shore. *Hex. V*, 35.

V, 528 ff. Introduction to the account of the birds. *Hex. V*, 36, 37.

\*V, 546 ff. The phoenix. *Hex. V*, 79, 80. The tale follows the *Phoenix* of Lactantius (cf. F. Lauchert, *Geschichte des Physiologus*, pp. 220 f.). The description of the bird's plumage seems to be drawn from Pliny x. 3. The moral on the new birth (vs. 592) comes from Ambrose *Hex. V*, 80, 110 C.

V, 598 ff. The swallow. *Hex. V*, 56.

V, 616 ff. The nightingale. *Hex. V*, 85. Du Bartas substitutes an account which depends closely on Pliny x. 81-83.

V, 714 ff. The halcyon. *Hex. V*, 40-42. The description of the nest is probably drawn from Pliny x. 90, 91.

V, 746 ff. The filial stork. *Hex. V*, 55.

V, 774 ff. The instinctive affection of animals for their young. *Hex. VI*, 21, 22.

V, 826 ff. The peacock, the cock. The two descriptions in close succession may be the elaboration of the words of Ambrose: *gallus iactantior, pavo speciosior*, *Hex. V*, 49.

V, 860 ff. The republic of the bees. *Hex. V*, 67 ff.

V, 880 ff. The silk-worm. *Hex. V*, 77.

\*VI, 1 ff. Introduction to the account of the beasts. *Hex. VI*, 2.

\*VI, 49 ff. The fight between the elephant and the draco. *Hex. III*, 40.

VI, 129 ff. The sagacity of the hedgehog. Ambrose *Hex. VI*, 20 tells two traits of the animal: (1) it protects itself with its quills; (2) it foresees changes of the wind and shifts the opening of its den accordingly. Du Bartas repeats the first of these here; the other he has just narrated of the squirrel (vss. 117 ff.). In this he follows Pliny, who in his account of the hedgehog merely touches on the second trait, viii. 133, but tells it of the squirrel, viii. 138. Somewhat similarly Du Bartas follows Pliny ix. 89, 90, in ascribing to the ozaena (V, 212 ff.) a trait which Ambrose tells of the crab, *Hex. V*, 22.

VI, 169 ff. Why did God create serpents and poisonous animals? *Hex. VI*, 38.

VI, 401 ff. The Delphic maxim, "Know thyself." *Hex. VI*, 39.

VI, 449 ff. A development of Ambrose's reasoning on the words: *Paciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, *Hex. VI*, 40. Apparently the abstract qualities (vss. 456 ff.) take the place of the angels whom Ambrose rejects as possible interlocutors. Are the words *Il s'aida d'en delay* (vs. 475) a distortion of *requieuit autem, postquam hominem ad imaginem suam fecit*, *Hex. VI*, 49, 132 B?

VI, 493 ff. The upright human posture. *Hex. VI*, 54.

\*VI, 499 ff. The passages on the particular parts of the body have already been quoted. *Hex. VI*, 54-74.

VI, 1026 ff. The animals reproduce, each after its kind, *Hex. VI*, 9. These lines are not found in the first edition but appear in the revised text

of 1583. They offer interesting evidence that Du Bartas returned to the sermons when revising his text. The verse on the pearl (II, 1060), which likewise appears first in the revised text, would offer another instance, if we could be sure that the passage is really due to *Hex. V*, 33.

VII, 501 ff. Sex in the palm-tree. *Hex. III*, 55.

VII, 555 ff. Bees and their monarch. *Hex. V*, 68.

VII, 569 ff. The eagle and its young. This resembles the tale which Ambrose tells of the hawk, *Hex. V*, 59. He treats of the eagle immediately afterward. Apparently Du Bartas, either inadvertently or on purpose, ascribed to the second traits which in his source were narrated of the first.

VII, 581 ff. The faithful turtle-dove. *Hex. V*, 62.

VII, 595 ff. Fishes offer a refuge to their young in their own wombs. *Hex. V*, 7.

VII, 647 ff. The ant. *Hex. VI*, 16.

We may notice in passing that the interest in the more or less fictitious natural history of the classic writers, which is so marked a feature of *la Semaine*, is already present in *Judith*, the earlier poem of Du Bartas, published in 1573. Here among the comparisons we find the honey-bee (I, 351), the ant (I, 391), the stork (IV, 145), the turtle-dove (IV, 301), the bands of the elements (VI, 230). Every one of these topics appeared later in *la Semaine*. But though they are all treated by Ambrose, there is no reason to think that at this period the Gascon was drawing from the Church Father. In fact, a comparison of the details in the descriptions leads to the contrary belief.

The question naturally arises whether a connection with Ambrose can be traced in *la Seconde Semaine*, the continuation of the poem, in which the main narrative of the Old Testament is reproduced. Did Du Bartas in writing his accounts of the patriarchs make use of the sermons on Paradise, Noah, and Abraham, in the same way that he had made use of the *Hexaemeron*? Not by any means to the same extent; but here also there occur from time to time passages which can be referred with confidence to the influence of the Church Father. There is, for instance, an interesting paragraph in *Eden* (143-52) in which Du Bartas protests against the allegorical method of scripture interpretation:

N'estime point encor que Moyse t'ait peint  
Vn Paradis mystique, allegorique, et feint.  
C'est vn iardin terrestre, heureux sejour des Graces,



Et corne d'abondance: à fin que tu ne faces  
 D'un Adam Ideal fantasque l'aliment,  
 La faute imaginaire, et feint le chastiment.  
 Car on nomme à bon droict le sens allegorique,  
 Recours de l'ignorant, bouclier du fanatique:  
 Mesmes quand es discours, où l'histoire on décrit,  
 On fait perdre le corps pour trop chercher l'esprit.

The casual reader would assume that these spirited lines were directed against some contemporary theologian of too liberal tendencies. In reality, the antagonist seems to be none other than the Bishop of Milan, who in his sermon *De paradiso* (51) shows a disposition to view with favor a symbolical explanation, derived from Philo of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup>

Unde plerique paradisum animam hominis esse uoluerunt, in qua uirtutum quaedam germina pullulauerint, hominem autem et ad operandum et ad custodiendum paradisum esse positum, hoc est mentem hominis, cuius uirtus animam uidetur excolere, non solum excolere, sed etiam cum excoluerit custodire. bestiae autem agri et uolatilia caeli, quae adducuntur ad Adam, nostri irrationabiles motus sunt, eo quod bestiae uel pecora quaedam diuersae sint corporis passiones uel turbulentiores uel etiam languidiores. uolatilia autem caeli quid aliud aestimamus nisi inanes cogitationes, quae uelut uolatilium more nostram circumuolant animam et huc atque illuc uario motu saepe transducunt?

This method of dealing with Holy Writ called forth the protest of the Huguenot in the same way that Ambrose's arguments against astrology roused him to the polemic, mentioned above.

I add a series of examples from the earlier books of *la Seconde Semaine*, which betray the influence of Ambrose.

*Eden* 633-38. The illustration of innate knowledge from the new-born lamb and the wolf. Cf. *De par.* 29.

*L'Imposture* 49-54. The devil's envy of man. Cf. *De par.* 54.

*L'Imposture* 87-90. The devil's reflection that if he should deceive man in the form of an angel of light, the Almighty might pardon the disobedience of the latter, may have been due to *De par.* 73, 178 F.

*L'Arche* 235-44. The justification of the Almighty for the destruction of innocent animal life in the deluge. Cf. *De Noe* 31-33.

*L'Arche* 349-56. The quaint query whether the olive leaf brought back by the dove was an old growth that had remained fresh under the waters or a new shoot, which had lately budded. Cf. *De Noe* 68.

<sup>1</sup> For the influence of Philo upon Ambrose, see Foerster, *Ambrosius Bischof v. Mailand* pp. 102 ff., and Schenkl's edition, where the parallel passages are noted.

*L'Arche* 362-64. Noah will not leave the ark without a sign from God. Cf. *De Noe* 75.

*L'Arche* 427-34. God's charge against homicide. Cf. *De Noe* 94-96.

Of the later portions of *la Seconde Semaine*, which were left unfinished at the author's death and gradually published later, I have been unable to see the French text. If, however, one may base conclusions on the English translation of Joshua Sylvester, here also may be found occasional instances of the influence of Ambrose. The encomium of hospitality in the story of Lot and the angels (Sylvester, *The Vocation*, p. 411, 1026-44) follows closely the sermon *De Abrahamo* I, 34. And the line (1022) in which Abraham recognizes the Almighty in one of his three visitors, "when, seeing three, he did adore but one," seems to reflect a direct translation of the words of Ambrose, *tres uidit et unum dominum adpellauit* (*De Abrahamo* I, 36, 296 B). Again, in the account of the trial of Abraham, the distinction made between the tempting of God and that of the devil (*The Fathers*, p. 422, 27-73) is drawn from *De Abrahamo* I, 66.

It remains to consider the relation of Du Bartas to George the Pisidian. We have noticed that the *Hexaameron* of the latter did not appear in print until five years after the publication of *la Semaine*. Are there internal indications which would justify the supposition of an acquaintance on the part of Du Bartas with the manuscript of the Byzantine author? I have noted four topics, which are not to be found in Ambrose, but which occur in both George the Pisidian and Du Bartas. Here one might look for direct connection. But closer examination indicates that the source of the French poet was not the Byzantine *Hexaameron*, but in three cases Pliny and in the fourth Aelian. The topics are: the marvelous structure of insects (Du Bartas V, 837 ff.; Georg. Pisid. 1253 ff. [Hercher's edition]; Pliny *N.H.* xi, 2); the trochilus (Du Bartas VI, 255 ff.; Georg. Pisid. 971 ff.; Pliny viii. 90); the spider (Du Bartas VII, 621 ff.; Georg. Pisid. 1166 ff.; Pliny xi. 80-84); the griffin (Du Bartas V, 664 ff.; Georg. Pisid. 921 ff.; Aelian *H.A.* iv. 27). There are, further, sixteen topics which are handled by all three. Four of these may be dismissed as inconclusive when taken by themselves. These are: the peacock (Du Bartas V, 826 ff.; Ambrose V, 49; Georg.

Pisid. 1231 ff.); the cock (Du Bartas V, 829 ff.; Ambrose V, 49, 89; Georg. Pisid. 1101 ff.); the Delphic maxim (Du Bartas VI, 401 ff.; Ambrose VI, 39; Georg. Pisid. 624 ff.); the digestive process (Du Bartas VI, 677 ff.; Ambrose VI, 71; Georg. Pisid. 681 ff.). Of the others, I quote in full one which deserves notice, as it has been cited by M. Pellissier (p. 71) as an instance of definite connection between the Pisidian and Du Bartas. The Byzantine poet has been treating of the union of the four warring elements and, in that connection, speaking of the gradual transition from one season to another. He then says (286-89):

καὶ τὰντα δρῶσιν ἐξ ἀμοιβαίου δρόμου  
 κόραις ὁμοίως συγχορευούσαις ἄμα  
 καὶ συμβαλοῦσαι τοὺς ἐαντῶν δακτύλους,  
 ὅπως χορὸν πλέξωσιν εὐρυθμον βίον.

The lines of Du Bartas are (II, 305-13):

Neree, comme armé d'humeur et de froidure,  
 Embrasse d'une main la terre froide dure,  
 De l'autre embrasse l'air: l'air comme humide chaud,  
 Se joint par sa chaleur à l'element plus haut,  
 Par son humeur à l'eau: comme les pastourelles,  
 Qui d'un pied treignant foulent les fleurs nouvelles,  
 Et maryant leurs bonds au son du chalumeau,  
 Gayes, ballent en rond sous le bras d'un ormeau,  
 Se tiennent main à main, si bien que la premiere  
 Par celles du milieu se joint à la dernière.

The resemblance is apparent. But let us look at the corresponding statement of Ambrose (III, 18):

Ergo aqua tamquam brachiis quibusdam duobus frigoris et umoris altero terram altero aerem uidetur amplecti, frigido terram, aerem umido. aer quoque medius inter duo compugnantis per naturam, hoc est inter aquam et ignem utrumque illud elementum conciliat sibi, quia et aquis umore et igni calore coniungitur.

It will be seen that the first four lines quoted from the French poem are a direct translation from this passage. And for the dance of the elements we may look to the words that follow:

. . . . . atque ita sibi per hunc circuitum et eorum quendam concordiae societatisque conueniunt.

We must conclude then that Du Bartas has not in this case borrowed from George the Pisidian, but that the similarity of the two passages is due to their common ancestry from Basil by collateral lines.

As for the other passages, those on the eye (Du Bartas VI, 509 ff.; Ambrose VI, 59, 60; Georg. Pisid. 713 ff.), the nose (Du Bartas VI, 537 ff.; Ambrose VI, 63; Georg. Pisid. 708), and the ear (Du Bartas VI, 603 ff.; Ambrose VI, 62; Georg. Pisid. 697) have been quoted above. The sources of the lines on the remora (Du Bartas V, 386 ff.; Ambrose V, 31; Georg. Pisid. 997) and the phoenix (Du Bartas V, 546 ff.; Ambrose V, 79, 80; Georg. Pisid. 905, 1105) have also been considered. The remaining six passages—the bounds of the sea (Du Bartas III, 51 ff.; Ambrose III, 10, 11; Georg. Pisid. 380), the vine (Du Bartas III, 509 ff.; Ambrose III, 49, 50; Georg. Pisid. 1610), the swallow (Du Bartas V, 598; Ambrose V, 56, 57; Georg. Pisid. 1303), the silkworm (Du Bartas V, 880 ff.; Ambrose V, 77; Georg. Pisid. 1278), the bee (Du Bartas V, 860 ff.; VII, 555; Ambrose V, 67–69; Georg. Pisid. 1151), and the ant (Du Bartas VII, 647 ff.; Ambrose VI, 16, 20; Georg. Pisid. 1200)—show details which link them with Ambrose rather than with the Pisidian, though it would be rash to assert that the Church Father was the sole and only source.

We find, therefore, no satisfactory evidence for the use of the Byzantine poem by Du Bartas, and the early French critics were over-hasty in pronouncing it to have been his model. Their instinct, however, was correct in looking for an *Hexaemeron* as a determining influence in the construction of *la Semaine*. In view of all the evidence, it may be safely asserted that Ambrose of Milan guided Du Bartas in the framework of his poem and contributed largely to its subject-matter.

S. O. DICKERMAN

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

THE ULTIMATE SOURCE OF ROTROU'S *VENCESLAS* AND  
OF ROJAS ZORRILLA'S *NO HAY SER PADRE*  
*SIENDO REY*

As early as 1722 it was known<sup>1</sup> that Rotrou derived the plot and the leading characters of *Venceslas*, his most celebrated work, from *No hay ser padre siendo rey*, but the source of the latter play remained undiscovered in spite of the various researches that it occasioned. Voltaire considered Rotrou's plot entirely fabulous.<sup>2</sup> Proper names, usually the principal resource of investigators, have in this case led them astray by suggesting that the history of a king called "Venceslas" was the source of the plays, although this name, found in Rotrou's play, does not occur in the Spanish work, where the monarch is referred to merely as *Rey de Polonia*. It has even been assumed that the sovereign treated is the Venceslas who was king of Poland and Bohemia at the end of the thirteenth century,<sup>3</sup> even though the life of that monarch is admitted to offer no resemblance to the incidents of the French tragedy, and it is difficult to see how this man, who was not yet thirty-five at his death, could be the prototype of the elderly king described by Rotrou and Rojas. Person<sup>4</sup> searched through various histories of Poland and Bohemia for sovereigns named "Venceslas," who might guide him to some anecdote on which the play could have been based. But it should have been evident enough to him that Rotrou's proper names could furnish no guidance, except in so far as they agreed with those of his Spanish source, for it is highly improbable that Rotrou had the least idea of the material

<sup>1</sup> *Mercure* for February, 1722, cited by the Frères Parfaict, VII, 180, 181.

<sup>2</sup> Second part of the Preface to *Sémiramis*.

<sup>3</sup> *Biographie universelle*, XLVIII, 111.

<sup>4</sup> *Histoire du Venceslas* (Paris, 1882), pp. 30 f., cited by Crane, *Jean Rotrou's Saint Genest and Venceslas* (Boston: Ginn, 1907), pp. 103, 104. It is also the influence of the name Venceslas that makes M. G. Reynier suggest that the source of Rojas and Rotrou was Belleforest's account of the murder of St. Venceslas by his brother. Cf. *Le roman sentimental avant l'Astrée*, p. 162, note 7, and the reply made to this suggestion by M. Haskovec in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, XVII, 156-57. While the latter writer makes it clear that Rojas owed nothing to Belleforest, he also shows that Dubravius was used as a source in western Europe long before the time of this Spanish dramatist.

that lay back of Rojas. Knowing that the latter laid his scene in Poland, Rotrou introduced the familiar Slavonic names Venceslas and Ladislas simply for local coloring, the same motive that led him to add to his Spanish model the geographical names Curlande, Cunisberg, and Moscovie.<sup>1</sup>

Evidently the only names that can help us are those of the Spanish play; but here the personal names, Rugero, Alejandro, Federico, Casandra, tell us little. The only real clue is given by the title *Rey de Polonia*, which suggests that the ultimate source deals with the history of some Slavonic country, if not with that of Poland itself. Following this suggestion, I decided to examine histories of Slavonic countries for the incidents and characters rather than for the proper names of the Spanish play. Before relating what I discovered, I must recall briefly to the reader what were the main objects of my search.

Rugero and Alejandro, the two sons of the King of Poland, are in love with the Duchess Casandra. Alejandro is secretly married to her. Rugero, a violent and passionate character, thinking that his rival is Duke Federico, whom he hates and who is his father's adviser, breaks into the nuptial chamber and kills the man at Casandra's side, whom he later finds to be his brother. The king, obliged to judge one son for the assassination of the other, at first condemns him, then saves him by abdicating in his favor, so that Rugero, now king, cannot be condemned, and his father, king no longer, can pardon his son.

In the histories of Poland and Russia I find no anecdote from which this plot may have been derived, but among the kings of the sister Slav state, Bohemia, there was an illustrious monarch, Vladislav II, who in 1173 abdicated in favor of his son Frederick. This same Vladislav had a faithful and efficient minister, Vogislas, and a violent son, Svatopluk, who, jealous of the minister's power, slew him before his father's eyes. I quote from Dubravius,<sup>2</sup>

Paulatim inde rex aetate ingraescente, curis regni, & laboribus praegravari, secumque meditari de onere tam graui vel deponendo, vel alleuando, idque cum fieri posse, nisi aliquo in sollicitudinis partem admisso, non

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Dramatis personae* and verse 75.

<sup>2</sup> *Historia Bohemica* (Hanau, 1602), p. 103.

videret, ad Vogislaum, quem praeter caeteros proceres beneuolentia prosequeretur, grauiorem negotiorum molem conuertit, additis cum quibus consilia actionesque communicaret. . . . Caeterum breui tempore Vogislaus, magnam in se multorum, inter quos Suatopluci quoque regis filii, inuidiam conflauit, propter benignum & largum erga se regis fauorem, ex re bene administrata conceptum, adeo vt idem Suatoplucus obuuium sibi eum ante cubiculum regium habens, eiusmodi verbis inuaserit: *Quousque tandem regnum spoliare per regias largitiones abs te exortas non cessabis? Quoad, inquit, tu rex designatus non fueris.* Quo ille responso irritatus, stringit pugionem, & fugientem in cubiculum, rege coram, sauciat, nemine in illum iniicere manum auso, quamquam rex comprehendi illum iusserit. Sed nunquam deinde in conspectu regis Suatoplucus venit, aliquandiu in Hungaria apud Stephanum regem, posthac vxore mortua in Bauaria apud Albertum fratrem suum, vsque ad exitum vitae commoratus. At rex ocio, & secessu Strahouiensi,<sup>1</sup> vel primoribus tantum labii degustato, abduci ab illo ne hoc quidem incommodo accepto, potuit, sed regno potius toto cedere Friderico filio maluit, non omnibus consilium illius comprobantibus; non quod Fridericus successionem parum dignus esset, sed quod vnum regnum, duos reges alere vix bene posset, quodque duobus seruire dominis videretur difficillimum.

It seems to me that we have here most of the elements of the Spanish play and that the changes and additions made by Rojas can be easily explained. In both works there are four important male characters, a king, his two sons, and a noble who assists in the government. The king is old, experienced, overburdened with the cares of state. He objects to violence in his son. He abdicates in favor of a son. He does not in the chronicle give up his throne to save his son's life, but the murder is at least partly the cause of the abdication. The noble is in both cases useful to the state, trusted by the king, firm and dignified toward the prince who seeks his life. Compare with the Latin account of Vogislaus the king's speech to Rugero:

Al Duque, que me sustenta  
La carga de mis cuidados,  
Con rigor y con soberbia  
Le quereis quitar la vida  
Porque yo le quiero.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He had built himself a retreat in the wilds of Strahof, where he consorted with monks and to which he retired after his abdication.

<sup>2</sup> Biblioteca de autores españoles, Comedias de Rojas Zorrilla, 389. Cf. also p. 390, where Rugero declares "El Duque en tu Estado reina."



In both works one son is sympathetically treated, represented as worthy to reign, while the other is violent, lacking in respect for his father's authority, hating the nobleman and desiring to kill him.

¿El Duque en qué os ofendió,  
Que con la espada sangrienta  
Le buscais puertas al alma  
Y á vuestras venganzas puertas?<sup>1</sup>

As in the Latin it is with a dagger that the murder is finally committed.

The differences between the Latin chronicle and the Spanish play are not difficult to explain. In the original text the murder is followed immediately by the abdication, a fact that would easily suggest to Rojas the addition of a causal connection between the two incidents. For the king to abdicate to save his son's life, rather than on account of old age and the cares of state, would give unity and dramatic interest to the tale. The addition of a love theme was to be expected. Political jealousy, however, which is the prince's motive in the Latin, is retained, though now overshadowed by the more romantic passion. The substitution of the brother for the nobleman as the victim is not, in its conception, a great change, for the intent to kill the duke is still a prominent motive in the play. It is probable that Rojas substituted the brother as the person actually killed to heighten the dramatic effect and to make it certain that Rugero deserved the death penalty. For a prince to murder a mere nobleman might not be considered a capital offense by the author of *Del Rey abajo ninguno*. Similarly the altered *dénouement* would necessitate the change of age between the two brothers. If the guilty brother remained the younger, his crime might seem to be inspired by a desire to clear the way for his own succession, which would make of the protagonist a calculating, rather than a passionate, criminal. It would also follow from the change of victim that the scene of the murder could not be acted as Dubravius described it, since there could have been no mistaking Alejandro for the duke, if the deed had taken place in the presence of king and court. Why Rojas preferred to lay his scene in Poland rather than in Bohemia is

<sup>1</sup> Biblioteca de autores españoles, Comedias de Rojas Zorrilla, 389.

not entirely clear. It is probable that the distinction between these two distant lands of allied speech meant little to either author or audience. Poland had, at least, the advantage of being an independent state, while Bohemia had become an Austrian dependency. The changes in personal names are more easily understood, for the three Slavic names, which are abandoned, probably grated on the Spanish ear. The more familiar Fridericus, though no longer assigned to the king's older son, is retained in its Spanish form and given to the duke.

Nor is it difficult to explain how a Spanish dramatist happened upon a subject from Bohemian history. Rojas was a favorite at the court of Felipe IV, whose queen was sister to the king of Hungary and Bohemia. The fact that the latter sovereign was made emperor in 1637, an event celebrated with great pomp at the Spanish court,<sup>1</sup> may have made fashionable the history of his domains.<sup>2</sup> It is not unlikely that some Austrian among the queen's attendants introduced Rojas to Dubravius' book, a work that had already been published at least three times<sup>3</sup> before the birth of the Spanish dramatist. I say Dubravius rather than Aeneas Sylvius, for the latter's history of Bohemia makes no mention of Svatopluk's deed. Of course Rojas may have used an intermediate source, but it has not been discovered.

The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that the ultimate source of the two plays is the historical event related by Dubravius. A dramatic imagination would be naturally attracted by the historian's account of the old Bohemian monarch, formerly a crusader, a successful warrior, a reformer of church and law, now weary of his rule, longing for his retreat in the wilds and for communion with his monks. Rojas must have been especially struck by the character of the prince, insolent, jealous, passionate, heedless of his father's commands, murdering the able and admirable minister whom he looked upon as an upstart intriguer. Finally, the monarch's abdication in favor of his other son must have started the train of thought that led to the composition of the plot. Having combined these

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, vii.

<sup>2</sup> *No hay ser padre siendo rey* was published in 1640.

<sup>3</sup> Prostau, Moravia, 1552; Bâle, 1575; Hanau, 1602. An edition of Vienna, 1554, is mentioned, on doubtful authority.

elements into a single theme, Rojas added other characters, romantic and comic situations, the dramatic scenes that resulted from the prince's mistaking his brother for the nobleman; but he kept in their essential traits the four characters of the Latin chronicle. Rotrou also, while making of the play a more sober, elevated, and psychological tragedy, held to the Slavonic setting, the four male characters, the murder and the abdication that Dubravius had described.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

AMHERST COLLEGE

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

*La Religion de J. J. Rousseau.* 3 vols. (I, *La Formation religieuse de Rousseau*; II, *La Profession de foi de Jean-Jacques*; III, *Rousseau et la restauration religieuse*.) By PIERRE MAURICE MASSON. Paris: Hachette, 1916. 10 fr. 50.

M. Masson, professor of French literature at Fribourg (Switzerland), had already made important contributions to the study of Rousseau, notably his critical edition of the *Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard* (1914). The present volumes were completed and partly in type before the outbreak of the war. The proofs were corrected by M. Masson while serving as second lieutenant in the French infantry. In April, 1916, he was instantly killed in action in the Argonne.

This work deals, not merely with Rousseau, but in no small measure with the whole religious development in France from the early eighteenth century to Chateaubriand. It has the thoroughness and accuracy that one has come to expect from the school of M. Lanson. There is also some suggestion of the defect to which this type of scholarship is exposed: the broad lines of the subject tend at times to be obscured by the accumulation of erudite details. A system of numbers in the footnotes refers to the bibliography at the end of the third volume, which runs to 643 titles. The extent of M. Masson's reading is also suggested by his nineteen-page index of proper names.

Extensive as is M. Masson's reading it needed in some respects to be even more extensive. His subject is, for the most part, the great deistic movement, and this movement is pre-eminently international. Deism marks an important stage in the process that has been going on for centuries, namely, the passage of man in his views about himself and his own destiny from a pure supernaturalism to a pure naturalism. Now deism was either rationalistic or sentimental. The chief rationalistic deist of the French eighteenth century was Voltaire; the chief sentimental deist, Rousseau. The origins of both types of deism are largely English. Some knowledge of men like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson is as helpful in understanding Rousseau as a knowledge of men like Locke and Bolingbroke is for understanding Voltaire. M. Masson's references to the English background are slight and superficial. On the other hand, he is very full and interesting on once-popular but now forgotten French authors of deistic tendency, like Claville and Saint-Aubin, of whom Rousseau made a careful study in his youth. M. Masson has also much to say of the deistic physicists (Pluche,

Nieuwentyt, etc.), who are even more anthropocentric than the earlier supernaturalists, who saw everything in nature arranged by a benevolent deity for man's especial benefit (hence the moral commotion caused by the Lisbon earthquake). This harmonizing of man and God and nature by a recourse to final causes, of which Rousseau himself is rather chary, reaches its extravagant culmination in a book like Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Études de la nature* (1784). Anticipations of the point of view of the Savoyard Vicar are also found by M. Masson in various Genevan writers (Marie Huber, Muralt, etc.).

One is struck by the hostile attitude toward intellect and science that already appears in a number of these writers. Up to a certain point the rationalistic and the sentimental deists worked together; they were both arrayed against supernatural religion, against revelation and miracles. Rousseau himself appears as one of the keenest of rationalists<sup>1</sup> in his attitude toward miracles. Voltaire, as we know from his annotated copy of the *Profession*,<sup>2</sup> took satisfaction in all this portion of Rousseau's argument. But having thus used reason as a weapon against the supernatural, Rousseau would then have it abdicate before sentiment, and at this abdication of reason Voltaire feels only disgust. Rousseau's great thirst is for immediacy. The inner oracle to which he is ready to sacrifice everything that is not immediate (including reason) he names variously sentiment, conscience, soul, heart. Rousseau's motto *vitam impendere vero* implies that he was willing to lay down his life for the truth, but as a matter of fact he had little concern for the truth unless, indeed, one holds that the individual is justified in identifying the truth with his own emotions. An error that consoled Rousseau seemed to him preferable to a truth that afflicted him.<sup>3</sup> Instead of adjusting his temperament to religion, he adjusts religion to his temperament. One may thus set up as religious without having to renounce one's ordinary self. M. Masson traces this development with psychological subtlety. "Il ne s'agit point de se perdre en Dieu, mais plutôt d'absorber Dieu en soi. . . . Dans le paradis de Jean-Jacques, Dieu lui-même s'effacera discrètement pour laisser place à Jean-Jacques."<sup>4</sup>

Rousseau's attitude toward religious truth is in the broadest sense of the word aesthetic. He not only tends, like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, to identify beauty and truth, but conceives beauty as the pursuit of pure illusion. "There is nothing beautiful," he was fond of saying, "save that which is not."<sup>5</sup> Religion may be not only beautiful and consoling to the individual, but it may also be justified by its utility, its social beneficence. "Il ne s'agit pas," says Rousseau, "de savoir ce qui est mais seulement ce qui est utile."<sup>6</sup> This is what we should call nowadays the pragmatic test. M. Masson indicates skilfully the relationship between Rousseau and recent

<sup>1</sup> See dialogue in the *Profession de foi* between "l'inspiré" and "le raisonneur."

<sup>2</sup> See *Annales Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, I, 277-79.

<sup>3</sup> I, 235; II, 89, etc.

<sup>4</sup> II, 120.

<sup>5</sup> II, 260.

<sup>6</sup> II, 256.

anti-intellectualist philosophers like James and Bergson. He might also have found in Rousseau an anticipation of Vaihinger and his theory of useful fiction.<sup>1</sup>

This testing of religion and philosophy, not by their intrinsic truth, but by their beauty and utility, was destined to have important developments, not merely in the Protestant, but also in the Catholic, world. Rousseau himself seems to have felt the superior aesthetic appeal of Catholicism. He was deeply moved, as we learn from Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, by the singing of "les litanies de la Providence" in the chapel on Mont Valérien.<sup>2</sup> M. Masson studies in detail the Catholic writers between Rousseau and Chateaubriand who tended to subordinate the truth of their religion to its aesthetic charm and social beneficence. No book was ever more thoroughly prepared for than the *Génie du Christianisme*.

The passages of Rousseau that point most plainly to this type of Catholicism are found in the *Profession de foi*; but another side of Rousseau's religious thinking, that embodied in the closing chapter of the *Contrat Social* (*la Religion civile*), is in the highest degree hostile to Catholicism, inasmuch as even the aesthetic Catholic is unwilling to subordinate himself entirely to the state. This chapter aims at nothing less than "to bring together the two heads of the eagle," as Rousseau expresses it; that is, to abolish the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal order which is at the heart of Christianity. Rousseau's attitude toward historical Christianity has, as M. Masson points out, much in common with that of Machiavelli.<sup>3</sup> By its insistence on humility, Christianity has made the citizen effeminate and undermined his patriotic pride. The remedy is to get rid of historical Christianity, and not only to make the state supreme, but also to set up a state religion—a religion that is not to be, properly speaking, religious, but merely an "aid to sociability." An old English poet describes religion as the "mother of form and fear." Rousseau would banish fear from religion entirely, and everything that is form and discipline being, as he holds, not of the essence of religion, he would turn over to the state. The essence of religion he sees in a fluid emotionalism, and this a man may indulge in without having two fatherlands, without dividing his allegiance between the spiritual and the temporal order, as he must do if he remains a Christian in the traditional sense.

One immediately relates Rousseau's hostility to Christianity as a form and discipline quite apart from the state to the anticlericalism that has prevailed in France from the Revolution to the present day; and the connection of Rousseau's religious ideas with those of Robespierre, for example, is close and indubitable. M. Masson makes clear, however, that we must be careful not to exaggerate the rôle of Rousseau in the rise of anticlericalism.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Philosophie des Als Ob* (1911).

<sup>2</sup> *Vie de Rousseau* (éd. Souriau), pp. 106 ff.

<sup>3</sup> II, 196.

Many other influences—that of Raynal, for example—tended in the same direction. M. Masson has brought out to some extent, following Aulard, the conflict in the Revolution itself between the rationalists (whether deistic or atheistical), who derive from Voltaire and the encyclopedists, and the sentimental deists, who derive from Rousseau.

The final impression one gets from M. Masson's volumes is that the main religious development from Rousseau is aesthetic and utilitarian Catholicism à la Chateaubriand. But sentimentalism of the type that appears in Rousseau has affected Catholicism only superficially, whereas it has eaten into the very vitals of Protestantism. To make his study of Rousseau's religious ideas complete, M. Masson would have needed to pay more attention, not only to their background in England, but also to their prolongation in Germany. "Rousseau's deeper influence is accomplished on German soil," says Professor Paul Hensel, of the University of Erlangen; "here he became . . . the founder of a new culture"<sup>1</sup> (*Kultur*). Now *Kultur* when analyzed breaks up into two distinct things: on the one hand scientific efficiency, and on the other what the Germans term "idealism." Rousseau is undoubtedly a main source of this idealism, so that to get at his more significant religious influence one would need to trace the transformations of Rousseauism in the writings of Kant, Jacobi, Herder, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Schelling, etc. In these German writers deism passes over into pantheism; and just as deism is either rationalistic or sentimental, so pantheism has tended to be either scientific or emotional. This transition from deism to pantheism can be followed, not merely in the Germans, but in a contemporary of Rousseau's like Diderot. Rousseau rejected pantheism, especially of the scientific type, but there are plenty of examples in his work of pantheistic revery, though he does not develop this pantheistic revery, as does Schelling in his *Naturphilosophie*, into a system of symbolism. M. Masson does not perhaps say enough about pantheistic revery in Rousseau and its relation to his religion, though in what he does say he shows his usual psychological subtlety. For example, he remarks: "La nature que Jean-Jacques adore n'est qu'un dédoublement de Jean-Jacques." "Il s'est senti à l'aise [dans la nature] parcequ'il s'y est senti seul, parce qu'il a pu s'y dilater jusqu'à l'envahir toute."<sup>2</sup> In short, communion with nature was a welcome substitute for traditional religion, because communion with nature does not impose any check upon one's ordinary self. A man may mix himself up with the landscape to any extent, and yet continue to suffer from what the philosophers term the egocentric predicament.

It should be plain from what has already been said that M. Masson's volumes are an important contribution to the history of ideas. They are not, however, for a reason that remains to be stated, an important contribution to thought. To make a contribution to thought M. Masson would

<sup>1</sup> Rousseau (1907), p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> II, 229.



have needed to discriminate with the utmost sharpness between religion and mere sentimentalism, and this he has failed to do. His inadequacy here, combined with the psychological subtlety he so often exhibits, is positively disconcerting. For example, M. Masson says of Rousseau's religion: "C'est un christianisme sans redemption et sans repentir, d'où le sentiment du péché a disparu et dont Jean-Jacques est à la fois le prêtre et même le nouveau Christ."<sup>1</sup> And then he proceeds to speak of Rousseau's "christianisme profond."<sup>2</sup> M. Masson has not made sufficiently clear to himself or to others that the difference between the supernaturalist and the naturalist (or the man who is tending toward naturalism) does not lie in the fact that the supernaturalist insists on dogma and miracles and revelation, whereas the naturalist rejects these things; the difference between the two is inner and psychological. Rousseau opposes to supernatural religion a plea for immediacy: ("Que d'hommes entre Dieu et moi," etc.<sup>3</sup>). But the supernaturalist also craves immediacy, only he perceives two elements in human nature that are immediate: on the one hand a stream of impulse and desire, and on the other an element that moves in an opposite direction and is known practically as a power of control over impulse and desire. Rousseau and the sentimentalists would follow the stream of impulse and desire, live temperamentally, in short, and at the same time set up as religious. Everything that opposes "spontaneity," that is, the free expansion of impulse, they would dismiss as factitious and conventional. I am indeed dealing only with the total tendency of Rousseauism. As M. Masson points out,<sup>4</sup> there survive in Rousseau many traces of the older dualism, the sense of a struggle between opposing elements, both immediate, in the breast of the individual, passages that imply the "civil war in the cave" of which Diderot speaks and which he deems purely artificial.

Language seems to break down in describing this dualism of the spirit. For instance, Pascal and Rousseau both refer to the inner and intuitive side of human nature as "le sentiment," "le cœur," etc.; they mean exactly opposite things. Rousseau, indeed, can only be understood as the extreme recoil from Pascal. For Pascal, religion was not only the "mother of form and fear," but he and the whole side of Christianity for which he stands pushed the form to a point where it became a strait-jacket for the human spirit, the fear to a point where it amounted to a theological reign of terror. M. Masson, misled by the prime emphasis that both Pascal and Rousseau put on "le sentiment" and "le cœur," inclines at times to see in Rousseau, not the extreme recoil from Pascal, but his continuer.<sup>5</sup> Confusion, it would seem, could go no farther. M. Masson has failed utterly to define the change that took place in the eighteenth century in such words as sentiment, heart, virtue, conscience, etc. Under the influence of Shaftesbury and Rousseau

<sup>1</sup> II, 294.<sup>2</sup> III, 42.<sup>3</sup> *Profession de foi*.<sup>4</sup> II, 115, 273.<sup>5</sup> I, 90; II, 57; III, 35, 103, 347, 357.

and the sentimentalists these words cease to stand for a force that puts a check on emotion, and become themselves expansive emotions. Virtue, for example, according to Rousseau, is not merely an impulse, but a passion, and even an intoxication.<sup>1</sup>

M. Masson shows the same inability to distinguish between religion and mere religiosity in dealing with a writer like Joubert, who comes at the end of his period. "Toute la dialectique sentimentale de Rousseau," he writes, "a trouvé ses formules définitives dans Joubert."<sup>2</sup> But Joubert is not, as one might gather from M. Masson, a religious aesthete; on the contrary, he is a profound and subtle moralist, a man of genuine religious insight. Now Joubert says that whereas virtue before Rousseau had been looked on as a bridle, Rousseau turned it into a spur.<sup>3</sup> This one remark throws more light on Rousseau's relation to religion and morality than anything that will be found in M. Masson's three volumes.

M. Bergson shows that he suffers from a confusion similar to that of M. Masson when he distinguishes two main types of French philosophy—a rationalistic type that goes back to Descartes and an intuitive type that goes back to Pascal.<sup>4</sup> M. Bergson would have us believe that he himself and Pascal are in the same tradition. Monstrous sophistries lurk beneath this simple assertion, sophistries which if they go unchallenged are enough to wreck civilization. M. Masson's error is so instructive indeed because it is not purely personal; because it points to some radical confusion, some grave spiritual bewilderment in this age. The men of the two chief Protestant countries are now engaged in blowing one another to pieces with high explosives and at the same time trying to starve one another's women and children *en masse*. Some might argue that a religion that has had such an outcome is bankrupt. One reason for this bankruptcy of Protestantism may lie in its failure from the very dawn of the sentimental movement to the present day to discriminate between genuine religious experience and mere emotionalism.

IRVING BABBITT

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> An influence on the eighteenth century which antedates the sentimental movement, and which in some of its aspects encourages this expansive view of virtue, is that of Jacob Boehme. This side of Boehme would seem ultimately to go back to neoplatonism. Goethe's expansive definition of the good in *Faust* and his identification of the restrictive principle with evil ("der Geist der stets verneint") plainly derives directly or indirectly from Boehme. See *Cambridge History of English Literature*, IX, chap. xii (especially pp. 352-53).

<sup>2</sup> III, 303.

<sup>3</sup> *Pensées*, etc. (éd. Paul de Raynal, 1866), II, 121; cf. also p. 364; "Rousseau a ôté la sagesse aux âmes, en leur parlant de la vertu."

<sup>4</sup> "On trouverait, en rétablissant les anneaux intermédiaires de la chaîne, qu'à Pascal se rattachent les doctrines modernes qui font passer en première ligne la connaissance immédiate, l'intuition, la vie intérieure, comme à Descartes . . . se rattachent plus particulièrement les philosophies de la raison pure." Article in *La Science française* (1915), I, 17.

*Teatro Antiguo Español. Textos y Estudios I. Luis Vélez de Guevara, La Serrana de la Vera.* Edited by RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL and MARÍA GOYRI DE MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. Madrid: Junta para Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas, 1916.

With this volume is inaugurated a series of critically edited Spanish plays of the classic period—the first enterprise of its kind in Spain. In spite of the rapid growth of scholarship in that country, plays continue to be almost as carelessly edited as ever. (Witness the recent volumes of the Academy edition of the works of Lope de Vega.) The present work is a protest against slipshod methods and a model for future editors to follow. The Señores Menéndez Pidal have been happy in the play they have chosen. In the first place, it is the unedited work of one of Spain's greatest dramatists and of high intrinsic merit. Secondly, it affords the editors a splendid opportunity to make valuable contributions in the fields of dialectology, lexicography, folklore, and balladry, in all of which subjects they are so proficient. Thirdly, this is the first of a cycle of plays dealing with the same subject, the study of which is important to the history of the Spanish drama. It offers opportunity for a comparative study of works by Vélez, Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, and others of lesser fame who have dealt with this same folklore theme. All these matters are treated in a magisterial manner. The most captious critic can oppose only trifling suggestions; but, as this work is the first of a series and a recognized model for those studies which are to follow, a few may be pardoned.

The editors scrupulously retain the old spelling of the original, making only the modern distinctions between *u*, *v*, and *b*. The *i*'s and *y*'s remain unchanged. But, contrary to general practice, they combine with ancient orthography the most ultra-modern accentuation and punctuation. It is very difficult for editors to agree regarding the system of accentuation to be employed in editing old texts. On the one hand, it is axiomatic that an editor should not follow the custom of the authors of the period, who made little or no use of diacritical signs; still less can he follow the anarchy of seventeenth-century printers in this regard. On the other hand, the present system, in conjunction with the old spelling, is anachronistic and shocking, e.g., *onrréys*. It is all very well to accentuate *ast*, but what is to be done when the word is spelled *asy*? He must either depart from his own system, as the present editors do in like cases, or have cast a new character which would offend by its novelty. The method employed by Morel-Fatio and Foulché-Delbosc seems better. Use accents sparingly—only when necessary to distinguish homonyms. The objection to this system is that it is purely artificial—an editor's invention; but it is less shocking to the reader. Similarly, the inverted interrogation and exclamation points give offense. Since the editors adopted the system they did, *quien* should bear the accent in

l. 512; *Esta* in l. 645; *si* in l. 665; *di* in l. 3066. The captain's speech, ll. 501-2, is plainly a question. The editors have followed the now almost universal custom of indenting the initial verse of each strophe, but have failed to indent the following lines: 37, 41, 269, 273, 463, 811, 823, 903, 2202, 2608, 2854. Lines 36 and 40 are erroneously indented. The proof-reading might have been more carefully done. The editors fail to indicate "asides," and such stage directions are helpful to the reader. The speeches beginning with ll. 2978 and 3014, for example, are manifestly to be taken as *apartes*.

*La Serrana de la Vera* was dated at Valladolid, 1603. This date is rejected on the ground that the author could not possibly have been at the time in the city named; 1613 is favored instead. Certain possible reminiscences of the *Don Quijote* may tend to confirm the impossibility of the earlier date. Madalena escapes through a *puerta falsa*, just like Don Quijote and Sancho (l. 1432). The composition of Giraldo's *olla* (l. 1808) is similar to that mentioned in the first chapter of the novel. Compare also Gila's vow (l. 2139). These resemblances may be wholly fortuitous, and are perhaps too slight to deserve mention. In the discussion of the *mujer hombruna* type, Tirso's *Antona García* and *La Gallega Mari-Hernández* might have been profitably studied. The type is precisely the same as that of Vélez' *Gila*, and some of the incidents are very similar.

The notes are so good that we wish they were even fuller. It would be too much to say that every difficulty of the text has been explained. To expect of an editor utter completeness of elucidation in connection with any text whatsoever is, as the good knight would have said, *pensar en lo excusado*. But in this case the gleanings left for future investigators are very few. The Señores Menéndez Pidal have once more given proof of their industry, conscientious method, and vast erudition.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

